

nations of several United States marshals, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WILLIAM J. THOMPkins

As in executive session,

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination of William J. Thompson to be recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate several days ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

#### TREATIES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

As in executive session,

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee having reported on an international telecommunication convention, the general radio regulations annexed thereto, and a separate radio protocol, all signed by the delegates of the United States to the International Radio Conference at Madrid on December 9, 1932, being Executive B, Seventy-third Congress, second session, I ask that the injunction of secrecy be removed therefrom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PITTMAN. I also report back favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ask for the removal of the injunction of secrecy therefrom, a protocol signed at Rome on April 21, 1926, and effective on January 1, 1927, substituting new paragraphs for paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 10 of the convention of June 7, 1905, creating the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, being Executive C, Seventy-third Congress, second session; and I submit a report (Exec. Rept. No. 3) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The report will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### RECESS

Mr. HARRISON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 17, 1934*

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

M. Frank Hammond, of Texas, to be United States marshal, southern district of Texas, to succeed Herbert E. L. Toombs, removed.

George P. Alderson, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal, southern district of West Virginia, to succeed John P. Hallanan, whose term will expire May 13, 1934.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1934

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Reverend Walter M. Degenhardt, of the Grace Evangelical Lutheran Church of New York City, offered the following prayer:

Lord God Heavenly Father, Thou eternal creator and preserver of mankind, Thou who holdest in Thy hand all the might of man, and who hast ordained the powers that be for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well, and of whom is all rule and authority, we humbly beseech Thee to so rule and guide the hearts of all Thy children that they may acknowledge Thee and exalt the Son of Righteousness whom Thou hast sent. Heavenly Father, we pray Thee to be present with us in our deliberations today. Look with favor and behold all those who have been placed in authority by a brave and united people. Replenish them with Thy grace that they may always incline

to Thy will and walk in Thy way. Prosper all good counsels and all just works that peace and happiness, truth and righteousness, religion and piety may be established among us throughout all generations. Into Thy hands we commit ourselves, unto Thy gracious mercy and protection we commend ourselves, as unto a faithful and merciful God. All this we pray in the name and for the sake of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### VETO OF INDEPENDENT OFFICES BILL

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address which I delivered yesterday in Greenfield, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by myself before a women's gathering in Greenfield, Mass., Monday, April 16, 1934:

On March 27 President Roosevelt vetoed what is known as the "independent offices bill." It contained a great many provisions, among them restoration of certain benefits to veterans and partial restoration of salaries to Government employees which had been taken from them by the Economy Act of 1933.

Following my vote to override this veto I received from residents of the First District 28 criticisms. Included in this number were several statements that I had voted from a partisan standpoint to aid in embarrassing the President, that I had endeavored to curry favor with certain groups of people to secure political support. There were also a few statements reflecting upon my personal integrity. I deny such allegations in toto. I am satisfied that my vote was proper; also, that if all the details of the complicated parliamentary situation were understood the criticisms would not have been made.

As a matter of fact, there has been a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding of what took place, and I should like to take a few moments to clear up the matter in the minds of my listeners.

The independent offices bill is one of the annual governmental appropriation bills. Included in it this year were the controversial items relating to veterans' compensation and salary reduction. In his veto message the President claimed that the bill went \$228,000,000 beyond recommendations that he made. This is clearly a mistake. As a matter of fact the passage of the bill over the President's veto resulted in a net saving in annual burden to the Government of over \$111,000,000.

In view of the enormous expenditures that are being made in connection with the so-called "recovery program", a great majority of Congress felt that a 5-percent cut was sufficient in the salaries of the regular Government employees, instead of the 10-percent cut recommended by the President, particularly in view of the depreciation of the dollar and the increased cost of living under the N.R.A. In addition to a 15-percent cut, these employees have been forced to take extensive furloughs equivalent to further cuts of from 7 to 21 percent. It should be borne in mind that the employees of the new alphabetical organizations, who are new and inexperienced, are much higher paid than the regular civil-service employees.

With respect to veterans, Congress voted about \$14,000,000 over what the President was willing to approve. Apparently the item which he chiefly objected to was that restoring the former compensation of veterans suffering from disabilities incurred in the service, which more than accounts for the increase referred to. These war-disabled veterans were cut from 25 to 30 percent, and, in some cases, as high as 60 percent, under the Economy Act of last year. I do not believe that anyone had any desire to reduce the compensation of this class of veterans by such a big percentage.

The following table shows the savings in veterans' benefits under the Economy Act and the amounts since restored by the President and Congress, also the remaining savings.

Original savings under Economy Act (exclusive of deferment of adjusted-service certificate fund).....	\$400,000,000
Subsequent Executive orders increasing payments:	
June 6, 1933.....	\$56,978,000
Jan. 19, 1934.....	21,000,000
Mar. 27, 1934.....	61,750,000
Total.....	139,728,000
Net savings after President's Executive orders.....	260,272,000
Legislation increasing payments:	
Independent offices appropriation bill, 1935.....	14,250,000
Net savings after President's Executive orders and act of Congress increasing payments..	246,022,000

One item that has been the cause of much criticism was that restoring the presumptive cases to the rolls temporarily until the question of service origin can be determined by the Veterans' Administration. This restoration was made by the President himself in his Executive order of March 27, 1934. The amount involved is comparatively small, about \$9,000,000. There are 29,000 cases involved, 15,000 of which are mental cases and 12,000 tubercular cases. Practically all these men are in institutions and are public charges. Presumptive cases are those where it has been impossible to prove service origin, but where the disability is presumed to have resulted from service. If a man is mentally incapacitated, he must be confined. If he has tuberculosis, he should be in a sanatorium. The only question here involved is whether he should be a Federal charge or a local charge. Inasmuch as these men are veterans and their infirmities are presumed to be due to the war, it is felt the burden should fall on the Federal Government rather than upon the local communities.

Other provisions of the independent offices bill, having no connection with the controversial items, effected a saving of over \$125,000,000. Therefore, in passing the bill with \$14,000,000 more than the President was willing to approve, Congress in reality, as I said before, made a net saving by overriding the veto of \$111,000,000.

It should be understood that there is still a further saving of \$250,000,000 still in full force and effect under the Economy Act in the field of veterans' compensation. If Congress had not eased some of the drastic regulations under that act, which were causing such mounting dissatisfaction and unrest among veterans and others, I feel that in a short time you would have seen not only all the savings of the Economy Act wiped out but a strong possibility of the payment of the soldiers' bonus involving an outlay of \$2,200,000,000 in inflated currency for the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates which will not mature until 1945. This enormous expenditure would make the amount involved in the independent offices bill look like pretty small potatoes.

As is well known, I have on numerous occasions voted against the payment of these bonus certificates before they are due. I feel that by dealing fairly with our disabled veterans we have lessened the probability of the payment of these certificates at this time.

Committee work has been so confining that it has given me less opportunity to visit the district while Congress has been in session than in some previous years. A chance to address constituents therefore takes on the nature of a report of the manner in which I have carried out my representation of you in Washington.

The Roosevelt administration has been in charge of government now over a year. We frequently hear the expression that the honeymoon period is over. I am inclined to think that is somewhat true. At the special session last year we accepted the policies of the administration blindly, having faith and confidence in the President and a willingness to give his experiment a trial. Following the special session I advised citizens to sincerely and fully accept the President's recommendations. There were items in the so-called "recovery program" with which I was not in harmony. I want briefly to review some of these with you now, as the time is approaching when we must take account of stock and note what material will be provided for the campaign this fall.

As a result of the unprecedented authority placed in the hands of the President by the legislation of the special session last year, we are now confronted with the biggest debt this country has ever known in peace times, and it is estimated that by the close of the fiscal year 1935 our public debt will exceed that following the World War.

One of the questions which the people will decide this fall is whether or not results have justified such enormous and in many instances extravagant expenditures. We are today paying salaries to 611,752 Government employees, not counting the Army, Navy, or C.C.C. services, which is an increase of 43,265 over last year. Through Democratic efforts the Civil Service system has been largely nullified. Only last week the House voted down an amendment to place under the Civil Service employees of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The Republicans in the House voted solidly for the amendment, which sought to take the home-loan service out of political patronage.

So many other important matters are pending that very little attention has been given to the merit system in the Government service recently. It may be desirable to build up a political machine, but if the machine fails in its accomplishment and the taxpayers are called upon to settle the bills, it will prove a boomerang, and I do not hesitate to assert that the thousands of additional Government employees who have been put on the pay roll during the past year will be a drawback rather than a benefit to the Democratic Party in the long run.

Figures are dry and uninteresting, but it is a fact that soon after I went to Washington, Congress was criticized for appropriating as much as a billion dollars in 1 year. It was called the "billion-dollar Congress." At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, it is estimated that we will have expended during this year \$10,560,000,000, or about \$29,000,000 per day, with an estimated deficit for the year of \$7,300,000,000 and an estimated public debt of \$29,840,000,000. These figures are taken from the official 1935 Budget as submitted by the President to Congress.

In other words, the deficit for this 1 year will be seven times the cost of running the Government 1 year soon after I came to Congress. The estimated cost of the entire recovery program of the President is \$14,373,000,000.

The people are, therefore, facing the question, Have results justified the expense? Or are we simply trying to pull ourselves up by the bootstraps? If much of this new legislation is to become permanent, as seems to be the program now, we will face the same questions in the future as we do today.

Voters in Massachusetts are asked whether or not they are willing to pay any part of the \$50,000,000 authorized to be expended at Muscle Shoals and in the so-called "Tennessee Valley." This was one of the first measures urged by the President. There is an old expression about making two blades of grass grow where one grew before. With the Tennessee Valley project apparently the effort is to make several blades of grass grow there instead of in Massachusetts.

Another item of the Roosevelt program that I have opposed from its beginning is the so-called "processing tax." Under this plan the Government enters into agreements with the producers of certain basic commodities, whereby the production of these commodities is reduced and the land thus taken out of production is rented by the Government. The rent money is obtained by placing a tax on the first processing of such commodities, and of course this tax is ultimately paid by the consumer. The present program runs through the year 1935, having begun last summer. It is estimated the payments to the producers during that period will be \$847,000,000 and the collections through taxes \$835,000,000.

A few days ago I received the following telegram from Mr. George M. Putnam, president New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation:

"One hundred fifty representatives of poultry, potato, market gardening, and fruit industries from six New England States in informal conference assembled here today. Urge the inclusion of an amendment to the Bankhead bill giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to prohibit signers of contracts on basic commodities from increasing production for sale of nonbasic commodities. We request that you communicate this action to Senators and Representatives from New England States and also inform conferees of action taken. This shall be in no way construed as an endorsement of other features of the Bankhead bill."

The above telegram was sent to the American Farm Bureau Federation in Washington and a copy handed me by that organization.

The desired amendment was originally in the bill but was taken out in the Senate.

Apparently the farmers of New England are not to benefit by the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Under the Bankhead bill, without the desired amendment, Southern and Western lands withdrawn from the production of basic commodities may be used to produce nonbasic commodities such as poultry, potatoes, market truck, fruit, etc., in competition with those of New England. I am sorry to bring such an unfavorable report to the farmers of Franklin County. This is another indication that the present administration is not in sympathy with the agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests of this region.

The Treasury Department reports the following collections under the processing tax from New England States to the end of February 1934:

Maine	\$1,451,000
New Hampshire	1,162,000
Vermont	175,000
Massachusetts	13,779,000
Connecticut	1,384,000
Rhode Island	2,469,000
Total	20,400,000

Against these collections of over \$20,000,000, New England farmers have benefited during the same period only to the extent of \$1,000,000 in payments under the agricultural-relief program, three quarters of a million having gone to Connecticut tobacco growers, and the balance to tobacco raisers in Massachusetts. Tobacco was the only crop involved in these payments.

On the 2d of March there was introduced in the House, at the behest of the administration and recognized as an administration measure, a bill authorizing the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations. Hearings were held for 1 week at which college professors, all of them members of the administration itself, testified. One of your own neighbors from Ashfield, Professor Dickinson, a most charming gentleman, advocated this measure and referred to it as a "new protectionism."

Secretary Wallace recommended doing away with small industries, which he described as being inefficient. When Republican members of the committee inquired what industries would be sacrificed on the altar of this new protectionism, the replies were noncommittal and general.

The idea of a reciprocal trade agreement is to reduce the tariff on a certain foreign product on the theory that that country will purchase more goods from us.

The worst feature about reciprocal trade agreements is that all authority under the Constitution now vested in Congress to fix tariff rates is relinquished and this power placed in the hands of one man, the President, with permission to change these rates within a range of 50 percent and at the same time to "freeze", as it is called, the free list.

Never before has such tremendous authority been given the President, nor has it been requested. The special legislation of last spring made the President a virtual dictator over domestic affairs. This law extends this dictatorship to our foreign trade.

Last Tuesday I witnessed one of the most remarkable scenes in my entire congressional life. Dr. Wirt, for 20 years superintendent



of schools in Gary, Ind., had been subpoenaed to testify before a special committee.

Our largest hearing room was packed to the doors with interested people, moving-picture men, photographers, and other scientific people and paraphernalia. Dr. Wirt made a severe indictment of the leaders of the "brain trust" who are today the chief advisers of the administration. He laid his facts plainly before the committee and told the committee that it could, if it wished, put the Government at work on the charges he made.

The substance of his evidence was the expectation and intention of those close to the administration eventually to overthrow the present social order, which meant not the overthrow of government but of the present method of government as handed down to us by our forefathers. It seems to me that such a possibility is a menace to our free institutions and the constitutional form of government under which this country has existed and prospered for a hundred and fifty years.

I never heard of Dr. Wirt before this matter came up, but he is an able, brilliant, and undoubtedly an honorable man. The majority of the special committee appointed to hear the case will ridicule him and no doubt the witnesses they will call will make light of his testimony. He has, however, accurately described the type of people who are the close advisers of the administration. Possibly some of these advisers, like Professor Dickinson, do not want to change the social order, but they do want to change the established principles of agriculture, industry, and commerce.

I saw the President take the oath of office as President of the United States wherein he swore he would support and defend the Constitution. He surely intends with all his strength of character to carry out that oath, but he has close advisers who are showing more and more their interest in a change in our social order which will naturally lead to some other form of government. This is another of my objections to the present-day regime and another reason why I feel that victories await the Republican Party.

I realize that you have such a galaxy of speakers that you cannot devote more time listening to me. I have just touched a few of the high spots showing how the kaleidoscope has been revolving. There will be more to be said in the coming months, and as inventory is taken of the Roosevelt administration it will be found that on one side of the ledger are admiration and respect for our Chief Executive personally, but on the other side of the ledger the most profligate and extravagant expenditures ever known in our history without value received. They are costly experiments, and I predict the American people will soon tire of them.

You have probably read the recent address in New York of Governor Ely. I am criticizing some of the abnormal policies of the present administration. Governor Ely now feels the time has come to get back to normal conditions, and he contends that such conditions would be much more quickly reestablished by abandoning the N.R.A. and other temporary activities.

Here is the expression of judgment by a member of the President's own party, and a man in whom the people of Massachusetts have twice shown their confidence by electing him Governor. By reason of his statement, I am glad it can no longer be charged that in taking exception to the Roosevelt program we Republicans are acting from partisan motives. I have received hundreds of letters from business men in this State relative to the N.R.A., and it is significant that the only one who was thoroughly in favor of it was an undertaker.

The Republican Party is therefore cheerfully facing the approaching campaign. Within a few weeks the preprimary convention in this State will be held. I am glad to learn that the personnel of candidates for delegates to the Republican convention is a very fine one. We look for splendid results for the party at that convention. It goes without saying that included in the names of the nominees will be that of John W. Haigis, who, in addition to his popularity in western Massachusetts, will add tremendous strength to the ticket throughout the State on account of his ability, integrity, and experience in public office. The contribution of Franklin County to the ticket reflects the high standards of citizenship in this section.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7835. An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. HARRISON, Mr. KING, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. REED, and Mr. COUZENS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8018. An act to authorize payment for the purchase of, or to reimburse States or local levee districts for the cost of levee rights-of-way for flood-control work in the Mississippi Valley, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3296. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Meridian & Bigbee Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Naheola, Ala.," approved January 15, 1927.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2811. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for municipal public works, including regrading and paving of streets and sidewalks, installation of sewer and water pipe, construction of bridges, construction of concrete bulkheads, and construction of refuse incinerator.

S. 2812. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000, to be used for the construction, reconstruction, replacing, and installation of a water-distribution system.

S. 2813. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Wrangell, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$47,000 for municipal public works, including enlargement, extension, construction, and reconstruction of water-supply system; extension, construction, and reconstruction of retaining wall and filling, and paving streets and sidewalks; and extension, construction, and reconstruction of sewers in said town of Wrangell.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL—1935

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is unavoidably absent, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9061) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that a moment so that I may ask a question of the majority leader?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. Is it the intention to bring up later in the day the conference reports the gentleman talked about last night?

Mr. BYRNS. So far as the conference report on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill is concerned, I have just been informed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] that he will ask to call up that report tomorrow. The Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who has charge of the conference report on the Bankhead cotton-control bill, is unavoidably absent at the moment. He indicated to me he would like for the committee to rise a little later on in the afternoon and take up that report. I told him that would be satisfactory to me if it was satisfactory to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who will have charge of the District of Columbia bill.

Mr. SNELL. Several Members have asked me to find out about the procedure, as they want to be here at the time the report is called up.

Mr. BYRNS. As soon as the gentleman comes in I shall inform the gentleman from New York about the procedure.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask a question of the majority leader?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Could there be given perhaps an hour's notice as to when the report will be called up, in order that

we may be sure of knowing when the conference report will be taken up?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; we can do that. What kind of notice would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. TREADWAY. Why not set some definite time?

Mr. SNELL. Why not agree upon 2 o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know whether that will be satisfactory to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] or not. I do not know whether the gentleman will be able to be here at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the matter with the ranking minority Member on the other side, and I ask unanimous consent that general debate run on today, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and myself.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Can we come to an agreement as to the time we will use in general debate as a whole; that is, whether the debate will go over to a future day?

Mr. BLANTON. This will be the last appropriation bill, except the last deficiency bill, upon which debate will be confined to the bill. In other words, this will be the last general debate on an appropriation bill during this session, and there are a great many Members who wish to speak in general debate.

Mr. DITTER. That is what I have in mind. I have a number of requests on this side.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it would be best to have the debate run along for the day, and we can come to an agreement later on with reference to closing general debate.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. I may say to the gentlemen, with regard to the conference report, that I cannot say whether it will be called up this afternoon or not, but we could have an understanding that under no circumstances will it be called up before 2 o'clock.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is entirely agreeable, so far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. SEARS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have received many inquiries relative to a river and harbor bill, and I take this occasion to make a general reply. On May 9 of last year a river and harbor bill was reported to the House and is now upon the calendar. This was done with the consent of the President, but with the understanding that congressional action would not be urged, awaiting the Public Works program then contemplated. Since then the program of Public Works has been inaugurated, and many of the projects embraced in the bill are now being carried out under that agency. Many others, just as important, have not been included. One of the major purposes of the Public Works program was to afford immediate employment, and preference, of course, was given to those measures which gave promise of the least possible delay in execution.

Since the river and harbor bill was introduced, additional projects have been reported by the Chief of Engineers, a number of which have already, in whole or in part, been adopted in the Public Works program. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has held hearings upon these measures, and last week reported another bill, embracing the projects in the former bill, with those approved by the committee since that bill was reported.

The President does not give his assent to the consideration of any river and harbor legislation at this time, fearing the effect it might have upon the Budget. He also contemplates a new program to be applied to inland waters. That, of course, has not yet been definitely worked out. However, the bill reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is largely for the improvement of port conditions on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, and upon the Great Lakes. These measures would not interfere with any proposed system of internal improvements. The amounts recommended in the bill for inland waters are minor as compared with those now under execution by the Public Works Administration.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. In the list of legislation which the President desires to have passed at this session, as I have seen it in the press, there is no mention of the so-called "works bill."

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman is correct. I presume they are expecting another appropriation.

Mr. CULKIN. So the zoning of the country by watersheds is for the present session abandoned.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman says that legislation on the river and harbor bill will not be urged.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was the bill of last year. There has been no understanding about this bill.

Mr. MOTT. Will there be legislation on the river and harbor bill of this year?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is up to Congress.

Mr. MOTT. Does the Rivers and Harbors Committee want a bill passed at this session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to have it passed, but I see no prospect of it unless the President gives it his approval.

Mr. MOTT. Then what is the purpose of introducing a bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have several purposes in view; one is that we want to put before Congress our recommendations as to what should be done. I am speaking for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Our views may not agree with the views of a majority of the House.

Mr. MOTT. Is it the intention to try to pass the bill notwithstanding the want of the President's consent?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not had any such view as that.

Mr. MOTT. I hope the gentleman will try to. I will do what I can to help him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That will be up to Congress.

It has now been 4 years since a river and harbor bill was enacted. A check-up for the past 128 years fails to reveal another instance where so long a time elapsed without a river or harbor bill or navigation measure of some kind, except in the years from 1860 to 1864. That was during the period of the great Civil War, or war of secession, when the country was torn asunder by sectional feeling and internal strife. In the year 1864, and before the war had ended, Congress realized the need of certain waterways for military use. In that year seven bills were enacted providing for harbor-and-channel improvements.

In 1866 a general bill was passed authorizing the largest expenditures for waterway improvements ever made up to that time, the appropriation being for more than \$3,700,000. In 1867 another bill was passed authorizing more than \$4,700,000. These expenditures were about equally divided between harbors and inland waters with substantial sums for investigations and surveys.



For many years prior to 1922 it was the general custom to pass a river and harbor bill at each regular session of Congress. Occasionally a bill would get caught in a legislative jam and fail to get through. In the Sixty-fifth Congress three general river and harbor bills were passed in the 2-year period, all receiving the approval of President Wilson. This was during the World War, when it was found that the country was in need of these facilities of transportation.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COLE. While we have had no river and harbor bill since 1930, can the gentleman tell us how much money has been expended on new projects under the P.W.A. since we passed that legislation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the gentleman will wait a little while, that question will be answered further on.

Since the adoption of the Budget, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors no longer being an appropriating committee, the necessity for a regular annual bill does not always exist. While under the 8 years of the Wilson administration 8 bills were enacted, only 3 such bills were passed in the 8 years of the Harding-Coolidge administrations.

Under the Hoover administration, the depression coming on, only one river and harbor bill became a law. That was in 1930 and was the last bill of the kind to pass Congress. Since 1930 no new river and harbor projects have been authorized by Congress, and no changes or alterations have been granted on those previously authorized. Still, our actual expenditures for such purposes have been far greater than ever before in our history.

In the first years of the depression, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was advised to curtail authorizations for future expenditures to aid in balancing the Budget and restoring public confidence. The committee cheerfully complied and refrained from reporting a bill. In other quarters efforts were made to increase the current expenditures for public works as an aid to reemployment. This idea finally prevailed, and expenditures in 1931 and 1932 for rivers and harbors were materially increased over that of previous years.

In 1933, under the administration of Mr. Roosevelt, the National Recovery Act was passed, and all river and harbor improvement works are now carried out under the Public Works Administration. This agency, under certain restrictions, is authorized to adopt its own projects for expenditures. It has allotted for river and harbor improvements, within the past year, \$178,769,908. Of this sum total, \$50,557,108, or approximately 30 percent, were for expenditures on projects previously authorized by Congress.

The other sums allotted for rivers and harbors, amounting to \$128,132,800, were for expenditures which Congress had not specifically approved but which the Public Works Administration had authority to adopt on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers. In order to complete these projects, additional expenditures of \$235,319,700 will be required. I believe that answers the question of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE].

These projects are all doubtless meritorious. No thought of criticism is here intended. In fact, projects embraced in these allotments, totaling \$46,879,500, had previously been approved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and recommended to Congress in the river and harbor bill reported last May and now pending upon the calendar. However, they have never been approved by Congress, nor has Congress had the opportunity of passing upon them.

Regardless of merit, large expenditures made without the specific authorization of Congress will naturally invite public criticism. Why provoke such criticism when Congress can so easily avoid it by passing upon these measures before the expenditures are made? Such responsibilities should not be placed upon the executive branch when Congress can and should take action. Expenditures made in that manner are perhaps justifiable in cases of emergency, but such emer-

gency does not exist where Congress has the opportunity to pass upon such matters for itself. Congress can now easily pass upon these measures and decide for itself where necessary expenditures should be made.

Conditions of commerce do not remain stationary. They are continually undergoing changes in development. New oil fields are being discovered. Sulphur mines and coal and mineral deposits are being developed. The products of the farm and factory are meeting with new conditions, requiring changes in the facilities for handling them. Types of ships and other floating craft are constantly undergoing a period of evolution.

In former years a 3- or 4-foot depth in our principal rivers would reasonably have accommodated the boats and traffic handled at that time. Such facilities under present conditions would be obsolete. Not only the rivers, but our ocean, Gulf, and Lake ports have undergone a similar change in requirements. The types of ships now in operation, and which are necessary for the economic movement of our commerce, require additional depth and width of harbor, channel, and turning basin.

There is nothing unusual or unreasonable in this constant evolution in our waterway requirements. Our railways and highways are undergoing similar changes to meet new conditions as they arise. The roadbed and rolling stock of the railroads of only a few years ago would be obsolete under present conditions. Neither could the automobile traffic of today be handled over the highways of yesterday.

Fifty years ago I was in the employ of the Southern Pacific Railroad as a freight clerk. A freight train at that time consisted of 30 to 40 cars, of capacity not exceeding 30,000 pounds, or 15 tons. Freight trains now frequently consist of 100 or more cars, with loads ranging from 50 to 90 tons to the car. Last week, Mr. Forsberg, chief engineer of the Pittsburg & Lake Erie Railroad, a very distinguished and well-informed gentleman, stated before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that his road, with the usual crew of five men, had hauled as many as 110 cars to the train, loaded with 6,000 tons of coal. This was 10 times the average trainload of a few decades ago.

In order to provide reasonably for our ever-changing conditions in shipping requirements, a national river and harbor bill should be passed by Congress at least every other year. We should have had one in 1932 and another at the present session of Congress. These matters cannot, except in a few isolated cases, be systematically taken care of in any other manner.

Such a course would not at all interfere with the annual Budget. Our actual expenditures for waterways the past 4 years, when no bills of authorization were passed, have been far greater than ever before and possibly greater than they would have been if we had gone ahead in the orderly manner of having Congress pass upon and approve the river and harbor projects upon which expenditures are to be made.

Congress has been conservative in expenditures for waterway improvements for purposes of navigation. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been extremely cautious in its recommendations to Congress for such expenditures. The elements opposed to those inland waterways that are thought to compete with the railroads have been loud in their condemnation of Congress but are silent as to the larger expenditures authorized for such purposes by the Public Works Administration.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentleman state specifically the amount of money which the Public Works Administration has allocated to river and harbor projects without coming to Congress or to a congressional committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One hundred and twenty-eight million one hundred and thirty-two thousand eight hundred dollars on river and harbor projects.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman include in that amount the additional amount required to complete these projects?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hundred and thirty-five million three hundred and nineteen thousand seven hundred dollars.

Mr. CULKIN. So that without having any say in the premises the Congress will be asked to appropriate \$250,000,000 for projects in which it had no voice?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the case with some of the expenditure made, some of which will go for nothing unless completed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. If Congress does not approve the further expenditure of the \$235,000,000 required, what will become of the \$128,000,000 that has already been expended?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a question that I do not believe I am competent to answer.

Mr. DONDERO. It may not be of any benefit to the people at all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Some of the expenditures will serve a good purpose, but many of them will be of no avail whatever until they are completed. There are so many different types of work included that one cannot place them all under the same category.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. To ask the gentleman if the policy that he has just outlined of river and harbor development by the Public Works Administration does not in fact constitute a complete surrender by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of jurisdiction over that branch of legislation, now vested in the discretionary jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Or the Administrator of Public Works, in that capacity.

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course that takes all that legislation out of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman does not agree with that policy, does he?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not, except for emergency work.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. In the gentleman's speech somewhere will he set forth the number of projects that had been taken up by the Public Works Division which never had been approved by Congress or by the Rivers and Harbors Committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not that list before me now, but I can insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. SNELL. I think that would be very good information for the House and the country to show the number of projects that have been taken up which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors or the Board of Engineers have never considered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Chief of Engineers has considered and approved all of them.

Mr. SNELL. They have not necessarily approved them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They have not been approved by the Congress; they have not been brought before Congress.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman should mention those projects that have not been approved by the legislative end of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe that the minority leader will find that data in the hearings on the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. SNELL. If that could be included in the speech of the gentleman from Texas, I think it would be good information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman will find it set forth there. I ask unanimous consent to insert them in my speech at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The list is as follows:

*Projects not considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee to which allotments have been made by the Public Works Administration*

	Estimated cost	Amount allotted	Additional amount required to complete
Delaware River, Philadelphia and Trenton.....	\$3,828,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,828,000
Savannah River, below Augusta, Ga.....	470,000	482,000	
Miami Harbor, Fla.....	3,311,000	2,000,000	1,311,000
River Styx, Fla.....	15,000	15,000	
Upper Mississippi River.....	104,850,000	21,850,000	83,000,000
Missouri River; dam at Fort Peck, Mont.....	66,500,000	25,000,000	41,500,000
Cumberland River, below Nashville, Tenn.....	868,000	868,000	
Kanawha River, W. Va.....	12,200,000	4,765,000	7,435,000
San Joaquin River and Stockton Channel, Calif.....	990,000	990,000	
Columbia River; dam at Bonneville.....		20,240,700	12,168,000
Olympia Harbor, Wash.....	24,000	24,000	
Kaunakakai Harbor, Hawaii.....	120,000	120,000	
Total.....	193,176,900	77,354,700	148,242,900

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. The distinguished gentleman from Texas mentioned that the P.W.A. had appropriated money, I think, to the extent of \$128,000,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. And \$235,000,000 for projects not approved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That have not been approved by the Congress.

Mr. COLDEN. Are there any improvements there that would not be classified as navigation, but might be of the nature of flood control and the development of power and other uses of waterways outside of navigation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Some of them are of that type, like the Fort Peck Dam, for instance, on the upper Missouri River, largely for flood control and for power, but incidentally for furnishing water for navigation.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The Fort Peck Reservoir involves governmental disbursements of something like \$900,000,000, does it not? According to the document presented by the engineers, \$400,000,000 is for power, \$400,000,000 is for irrigation, and about \$300,000,000 for navigation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am just speaking of the dam that has been approved. Twenty-five million dollars has been allocated to it now, and it will take \$41,000,000 more to complete the Fort Peck Dam, as I understand.

Mr. CULKIN. Neither the committee nor the Congress ever had anything to do with that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has not been before the Congress.

Mr. CULKIN. And it is also true that it will take 7 years for the reservoir to fill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will take a number of years.

Mr. CULKIN. I mean the time necessary to actually fill the reservoir.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not advised as to that; I do not know how long it will take.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DUNN. Is it not a fact that Congress has empowered the President of the United States to call upon the Treasury Department to spend money for construction purposes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. All this, of course, is authorized in the National Recovery Act. That is the source of the authority.

Mr. Chairman, there is another feature to which I desire to call attention. That is as to the legal status of those projects which have not been specifically authorized by act of Congress but upon which expenditures have been made by the Public Works Administration. Whether Congress has authority to consider those projects as having been legally authorized and can appropriate money for their permanent maintenance might be a question of grave doubt.



Neither the code nor act of Congress will contain the list of the projects or the terms of their adoption.

Mr. Chairman, the improvements of the seacoast and inland waterways of the United States for the practical and systematic movement of commerce is a question in which every citizen has an interest. We have expended for such purposes, through a period of more than a hundred years, approximately one and three quarter billion dollars, about 45 percent of which has been upon inland waters.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman spoke of the Erie Railroad. It is in my district. The gentleman's mention of this company brings to my mind the fact that the Monongahela River has more freight tonnage on it per square mile of surface than any other one river in the world. It cost the Government \$15,000,000 to build the locks in the Monongahela River, but over these locks since 1931 there has passed coal from West Virginia and the western part of Pennsylvania in vast tonnage. In 1931 there were about 6,000,000 tons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will ask the gentleman to make his question as short as possible, for my time is passing.

Mr. SNYDER. All right. We will have the gentleman's time extended if we can. The point about which I wish information is whether there is any place in the United States where a tonnage fee is charged for locking coal through canal locks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not in any Government project.

Mr. SNYDER. A State builds a bridge, for instance, and then charges a toll of 10 cents or 15 cents for each vehicle passing over it until the bridge is paid for. Is there any such policy in operation in regard to any of the waterways?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is nothing of that kind in any Federal waterway project. The matter of which the gentleman speaks is within the control of the States. Different States have different laws in regard to that.

Mr. SNYDER. Could a law be passed whereby a lockage fee could be charged?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It can be done. The President has had it under consideration. I do not know what decision, if any, has been reached.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman has in mind the theory that waterways should bear a tax in order to discharge the upkeep. The Rhine River has been used as an example of that system in operation in Europe; but is not that an entirely distinct situation where Germany, France, Holland, and Belgium participate in the traffic on that river and that it has no parallel whatever to the inland waterways of the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Rhine is an international stream, and most of the large rivers of Europe are more or less under international control. An instance of this is the Danube.

Under the engineers of the War Department, backed by the authority of Congress and the confidence of the American people, our improvements have become more nearly coordinated and systematized than ever before in our history. Many of our waterways, and especially our harbors and channels on the ocean, Gulf, and Lakes coasts, are sadly in need of alteration and improvement, as is shown by the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors during the past 2 years. It is to be hoped that these matters may be called to the attention of Congress at an early day.

Our total water-borne commerce, of course, has been decreased enormously during the depression, but is again assuming large proportions. The last annual report of the Chief of Engineers shows that the traffic handled through the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports amounted to 231,581,086 tons, valued at \$9,450,112,120. That of the Great Lakes was 54,913,140 tons, valued at \$893,207,794. Our rivers and other inland waters, after deducting duplications, had a traffic of 151,276,145 tons, valued at \$2,589,991,917.

These were the figures for 1932, and are from the latest official reports available. Reports for 1933 so far as heard

from through the port authorities, in many instances, show enormous increases over the previous year.

The public was recently given a brief synopsis of the plans of the President for a national system, consisting of commissions to take charge of the several watersheds of the United States, for the purpose of planning and improving our rivers for all national purposes. These purposes are so closely interrelated as to seem incapable of being segregated. The country looks forward with interest to whatever successful and comprehensive plan that may be evolved.

Any successful program that can be worked out must necessarily be based upon the information obtained in response to the surveys embraced in Document No. 308, authorized by Congress in the river and harbor bill of 1925.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the gentleman believe that Congress should delegate to any departmental group power to initiate and control the development of these improvements in inland or coastal waterways? Is this the gentleman's judgment after his long and distinguished service in connection with this matter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand the proposition, they can act in an advisory capacity only. Reports are to be made to them and they in turn make their recommendation to Congress, but Congress is the final arbiter in the proposition.

Mr. CULKIN. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I do not know for a certainty.

Mr. CULKIN. Under existing law these matters, such as the Fort Peck Reservoir or the Grand Coulee Dam, involving \$50,000,000, has not come to Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. CULKIN. And have not been considered by any committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but that is not in the permanent program for the future; that is under the Public Works Administration for temporary emergency expenditure.

Mr. CULKIN. It is, however, a rather healthy disbursement; but what I am getting at—and I hate to take up the gentleman's time—is the gentleman's opinion, based on his long service and experience, as to the advisability of Congress by legislation delegating to any bureau or department the power to initiate, regulate, or enter into improvements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe my answer to the gentleman from Oregon a while ago is an answer to the question of the gentleman from New York—that they can be regarded only as emergency measures and not permanent works.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the gentleman's opinion as to whether or not commissions can work out rivers and harbors projects better than the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this Congress?

Mr. MANSFIELD. They could not unless they were better informed upon the subject than is the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. DONDERO. The record for 140 years shows that it has been taken care of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the way it appears to me. This was the case with the Tennessee River, where a most thorough study was made under Document No. 308, and also under the survey in the river and harbor bill of 1922, when a half million dollars was authorized for the commencement of the studies.

After securing the information provided for in the bills reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the Tennessee River, with all its works for navigation installed during a period of 80 years, was then taken completely out of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. And is it not a fact that not only was Congress ousted from this situation but the engineers who

made the survey costing a million dollars were also ousted and have nothing to do with it at the present time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Tennessee Valley Authority under that law has full power to act.

Mr. CULKIN. And the engineers are not in the picture?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Only insofar as they are continued in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE], a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, was the author of the provision for the general purpose survey of the Tennessee River, and other rivers, embraced in Document No. 308. The pioneering of this program was on the Tennessee. When the time came for its culmination, in the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the gentleman from Alabama, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, was not permitted to enter with the host into this land of promise, to which he had led the way, but, like his prototype of old, was permitted to view the scene from a distant mountain top.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I may be pardoned if I call attention to conditions under which the ocean commerce of my home State of Texas is laboring. On page 53 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations for the War Department for the fiscal year 1935, there is a table of ports inserted by General Pillsbury, Assistant Chief of Engineers. It embraces our 20 leading ports for the year 1932. The tonnage, of course, was far below the average of a few years ago, but in each of 13 of these ports, for the year 1932, more than 10,000,000 tons of freight were handled. These ports, in the order of their rank, are as follows:

Rank, Port, Tonnage	
1 New York, N.Y.	87,733,459
2 Philadelphia, Pa.	18,837,838
3 Los Angeles, Calif.	18,288,705
4 Boston, Mass.	14,012,172
5 Beaumont, Tex.	13,218,880
6 Houston, Tex.	12,710,432
7 Baltimore, Md.	12,227,271
8 Norfolk, Va.	11,524,264
9 Buffalo, N.Y.	11,146,462
10 Toledo, Ohio	10,790,210
11 Port Arthur, Tex.	10,612,975
12 Duluth, Minn.	10,519,804
13 New Orleans, La.	10,491,084

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLDEN. I call attention of the gentleman to the fact that the year 1932 is rather unfair to the port of Los Angeles, because in that particular year Philadelphia crowded Los Angeles from second place by a few hundred thousand tons. I also call attention of the gentleman and my colleagues to the fact that for the year 1931, for instance, Philadelphia had a tonnage of 19,283,863 tons and Los Angeles had a tonnage of 23,097,778 tons, or nearly 4,000,000 tons more than our rival, the city of Philadelphia; that in 1929 the Philadelphia tonnage was 21,674,752 tons, while Los Angeles had a tonnage of 29,106,095 tons, or almost 8,000,000 tons in excess of Philadelphia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman from California is correct. The shipping conditions of 1932 were abnormal, and many of these ports normally have millions of tons more than embraced in the table put in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COLDEN. Does not the Philadelphia tonnage include the Schuylkill River as additional territory to that port?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Delaware River?

Mr. COLDEN. The Schuylkill River.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should judge so. These were the only American ports that handled as much as 10,000,000 tons in 1932. Three of these ports, Buffalo, Toledo, and Duluth, are upon the Great Lakes, where the requirements for shipping are entirely different from those upon the high seas. Of the 10 ocean and Gulf ports, handling more than 10,000,000 tons each in 1932, 3 were in Texas—Beaumont, Houston, and Port Arthur. It is a significant fact that the present project depth in each of these Texas ports is only 30 feet, while all of the other ocean and Gulf ports em-

braced in the table have project depths of from 35 to 40 feet.

I have here a photostat from the Engineer's office, showing that the tonnage of these three Texas ports for the year 1933 registered a gain over that shown in the table for 1932 of 8,060,691 tons, and this did not include cargoes in transit and bunker fuel which would add nearly 3,000,000 tons additional.

These conditions in Texas should be brought more nearly to an equality with other ports handling a like amount of shipping of similar character. They have been approved for a depth of 32 feet by the engineers of the War Department, and each of them is now embraced in the pending river and harbor bill, which has not come to a vote. It is true, they have been approved by the Public Works Administration for a portion of the money necessary to give them this proposed depth of 32 feet. However, the allotments of the Public Works Administration, according to the estimates, will lack \$1,000,000 of giving the required depth to the Houston Ship Channel, and nearly another \$1,000,000 on the Sabine-Neches waterway on which the ports of Beaumont and Port Arthur are situated. Unless the required depth of 32 feet is given the entire length of these respective ship channels, then the 32-foot depth given to them on three fifths of the distance will be of little avail. The tonnage handled in these Texas ports is of such a nature as to require sufficient depth to accommodate the freight and tank ships of the largest capacity afloat.

At the ports of New Orleans and Baton Rouge—ports comparable with those of Texas as to the type of ships and character of commerce, but where a least depth of 35 feet is available—338 ship entries were made in 1933 by ships drawing more than 30 feet. On page 952, volume 1, Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1930, it is shown that for the previous year 82 ship entries were made through the Southwest Pass of the Mississippi by ships drawing more than 30 feet, the maximum draft for that year being 33 feet. None of these ships can enter any Texas port when loaded to capacity. This is the equivalent of a tax that must be borne by the producers and consumers of that commerce, the largest items of which are oil and gasoline, cotton and wheat.

I simply call attention to these matters for the purpose of illustrating the need for a river and harbor bill to more nearly equalize the conditions of shipping upon the Gulf, in which the producers and consumers of the whole country have an interest.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any reason why a small amount of money might not be allotted out of the Public Works fund to increase the depths of the Texas ports to accommodate these other vessels which cannot now enter the ports with cargoes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If they have the money, there is no reason why that should not be done. They claim they have no more money. They have allotted enough to do approximately three fifths of the work, with the expectation doubtless of making further allotments. Unless further allotments are made and the money provided, the money that has been expended and the work being carried out now will serve very little purpose.

Mr. DONDERO. Would not this small amount of money have served a better purpose rather than to have expended \$128,000,000 on projects which were not approved by the committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot pass upon matters that the Public Works Administration has passed upon, because I do not know what evidence they had before them.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. The gentleman does not think the Public Works Administration, after beginning these projects, are going to walk away from them and not finish the projects? That seems ridiculous to me. As a matter of fact, they are going to ask for more appropriations in this Congress.



Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not made any intimation to that effect that I know of.

Mr. THOM. I thought that was the drift of the conversation here, that the Public Works Administration was going to walk out on those partly finished projects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I said the claim was made that they had no more money available.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. ADAMS. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, does not the gentleman think it would be advisable if a bill is brought in appropriating money for P.W.A. work that the appropriation be earmarked to continue, carry out, and complete worth-while projects already undertaken?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should favor the earmarking of all appropriations that can be consistently earmarked.

Mr. ADAMS. My thought is that if we are not sure they are going to be continued by the administration, why not make sure of that fact by having the funds so earmarked.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That will be up to Congress.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Is it not a fact that the P.W.A. is merely an emergency recovery proposition and has no assurance of a continuous existence?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is entirely correct, as I understand the matter.

Mr. Chairman, our river and harbor legislation has had a tortuous road to travel. A few references might not be without interest. In our early history internal improvements by the Federal Government were generally regarded as being unconstitutional or, at least, of doubtful constitutionality. Though, dating back even to the first Congress, bills were passed for the maintenance of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers as aids to navigation.

Under the administration of Mr. Jefferson two bills were passed for the erection of public piers in the Delaware River; one in 1802, the other in 1806. In 1809 he approved a bill for deepening and extending to the Mississippi River the canal of Carondelet. In 1808 Mr. Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Jefferson, advocated the improvement of highways and waterways as the permanent policy of the Federal Government.

In 1817 Mr. Madison vetoed a bill for internal improvements, including waterways. In his message he said:

The legislative powers vested in Congress are specified and enumerated in the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, and it does not appear that the power proposed to be exercised by the bill is among the enumerated powers.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman has given us a history of these improvements. A few weeks ago there was a resolution brought in on the floor one morning without discussion and without the Chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee or any member of the committee knowing anything about it, asking that the President be requested to make and furnish to the House and Senate a report on a comprehensive plan for the improvement and development of the rivers of the United States, all of which information was and is now available in Report No. 308 that the Board of Engineers and the various engineering officers of the country have made over a period of years under direction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The resolution was adopted by the House, and we are expecting that this report will be furnished to the Congress within the next few days or few weeks.

This resolution was brought in by the Flood Control Committee, which had no jurisdiction over any of the matters mentioned in the report to be submitted except the one item of flood control. When the report comes in, does not the gentleman believe it should be referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee for study and consideration and that any legislation affecting navigation or affecting any parts of the

report other than the flood-control feature should be directed to the Rivers and Harbors Committee and that the Rivers and Harbors Committee should prepare such legislation and report?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think there is any doubt about that matter.

Mr. PARSONS. I have quite a history here of the development of Rivers and Harbors and of the Flood Control Committees. The Rivers and Harbors Committee was created in 1882 or 1883. It had jurisdiction over the improvement of rivers for navigation, for power of flood control, irrigation, and reclamation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And pollution.

Mr. PARSONS. All of these matters were taken care of and the appropriations, up until the Budget was created in 1921, for all these purposes were passed upon by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and reported to the House. In the creation of the Flood Control Committee the former leader of this House, the Honorable Finis Garrett, brought in a rule on February 3, 1916, to create this committee, and among other things, in talking about the jurisdiction that the committee would have, he said that the committee would have jurisdiction of that subject matter only, speaking of flood control, and therefore the Rules Committee reported unanimously to create this committee to have charge of one thing only, and that was flood control. There was quite a discussion in the RECORD as of that date, and on page 2069 of the RECORD, Mr. Sparkman who was interested at that time in rivers and harbors had this to say—

Mr. MANSFIELD. He was chairman of the committee.

Mr. PARSONS. Yes; and he rose and asked this question:

What I want to ask is what effect would this rule, if adopted, or this amendment to the rule, and the investigation by this committee under it have on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors over that class of work?

Mr. Garrett, answering, had this to say:

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that bills relating to flood control would be referred to this new committee if the rule be adopted. I do not think that those bills which refer to the question of navigation of the Mississippi would be referred to this new committee but that they would be referred, as they have always been since the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was created, to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Now, in view of the evidence in the RECORD as to the creation of this committee, does not the gentleman believe that when this report comes back to the Congress it should be referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, because the Rivers and Harbors Committee was the parent committee of all these things in the beginning, and having had the Army engineers and the Board of Engineers make the surveys that this report will contain, as a natural consequence, it should go to this committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may state to the gentleman that I think there was some further discussion of the subject. Was there not a question asked, If a proposition embraced a mixed question of flood control and navigation, to what committee it would be referred?

Mr. PARSONS. It would go to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think Mr. Garrett gave that assurance before the committee was created.

Mr. PARSONS. He did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I went on that committee a few months afterward, in March 1917, and served on it for 4 years.

Mr. PARSONS. If the gentleman will yield further, after the Committee on Flood Control was created in 1916, it reported out a bill known as the "act of March 1, 1917", and they exceeded their authority and jurisdiction at the time they reported their first bill because, in section 3 of the first flood-control act, this committee took charge and took jurisdiction of all of the questions embraced in flood control, navigation, reclamation, irrigation, drainage of swamps, power, and others. The language runs something like this: That all examinations and surveys of projects relating to flood control shall include a comprehensive study of the

watershed or watersheds. There is nothing in the rules of the House that would give them jurisdiction over any such matters.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PARSONS. In just a moment; let me finish this quotation:

And the report thereon, in addition to any other matters upon which a report is required, shall give such data as it may be practicable to secure in regard to the extent and character of the area to be affected by the proposed improvements; the probable effect upon any navigable water or waterway, the possible economical development and utilization of water power and such other uses as may be properly related to or coordinated with the project.

In other words, they just spread their wings on March 3, 1917, and encompassed the whole scheme of everything which the Rivers and Harbors Committee had done since 1882.

Mr. WILSON. Since the gentleman is quoting from my speech, will not the gentleman yield? That provision that is in the Flood Control Act authorizing these surveys was passed by Congress, was it not?

Mr. PARSONS. It was passed by the House.

Mr. WILSON. Then it became the law and superseded any law preceding that date.

Mr. PARSONS. It did not supersede the jurisdiction of the Flood Control Committee, because the rules of the House provided for the jurisdiction of the Flood Control Committee and not this act.

Mr. WILSON. The passage of any act supersedes any prior act.

Mr. PARSONS. Not at all.

Mr. WILSON. That is the law.

Mr. PARSONS. The committees function under the rules of the House, and the House decides upon the matters which may be assigned to the different committees.

Mr. WILSON. But did not Congress pass the act giving that authority to the Flood Control Committee?

Mr. PARSONS. They passed this act I have referred to.

Mr. WILSON. And that is the law.

Mr. PARSONS. But that does not give the Flood Control Committee jurisdiction of these subjects, because that is within the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee under the rules of the House.

Mr. WILSON. An act of Congress supersedes the rules of the House.

Mr. PARSONS. I cannot agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. WILSON. I want to correct the gentleman's statement about the record. This resolution referred to was introduced by me in the House and by Senator NORRIS in the Senate. It was not a resolution giving certain authority to the Committee on Flood Control but was a resolution asking that the President send recommendations to the Congress upon these questions.

Mr. PARSONS. Did not the gentleman have this resolution before his committee for discussion?

Mr. WILSON. I did not.

Mr. PARSONS. The Committee on Flood Control knew nothing about the resolution?

Mr. WILSON. Oh, so far as that is concerned, they probably knew about it; but that was not necessary, because the act of Congress itself in making provisions for the jurisdiction of the Committee on Flood Control naturally carried the authorization there.

Mr. PARSONS. The Committee on Flood Control has no jurisdiction of any question except the matter of flood control. It certainly has no jurisdiction over power or navigation. Those matters have been with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for more than 50 years.

Mr. WILSON. The major features involved in all those questions relate to flood control, and the surveys are made under the authority granted by the creation of the Committee on Flood Control. There is no conflict between the Committee on Flood Control and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I am sorry that such a question has been raised, because this act of Congress was supported by the

LXXVIII—423

leaders on the Republican side and upon the Democratic side and the then Speaker of the House and the leader on the Republican side, and in creating this committee they gave it authority to handle these investigations which coordinate a national plan and delegated to it the handling of reports made by the same engineering bodies that are under the control of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. PARSONS. If the gentleman from Texas will yield further, the gentleman from Louisiana does not contend for a moment that the Flood Control Committee has jurisdiction over matters of navigation.

Mr. WILSON. Incidental to flood control; yes.

Mr. PARSONS. Storage of water, creation of power, is not within the committee jurisdiction.

Mr. WILSON. If the major portion of the project is improvement of rivers and harbors, it goes to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. If the main portion is flood control, it goes to the Committee on Flood Control.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not want to enter into any discussion as to the jurisdiction of the two committees, but I have been interested in listening to the passage between the two gentlemen relative to the two committees. I was a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors when the Committee on Flood Control was set up. I was interested in listening to what Mr. Garrett said at that time about the jurisdiction of the two committees.

As I recall the history under which it was set up—I think it is fair to say to the House that the jurisdiction of the Flood Control Committee went way beyond what the Rivers and Harbors Committee expected it would.

It was brought about in a peculiar way. Mr. Sparkman, of Florida, was Chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. He was a delightful gentleman, a competent and efficient chairman. The next man to him was Ben Humphreys, of Mississippi, who was also a leader, but there was no possibility of Mr. Humphreys ever becoming chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the House, I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more, and out of that I hope he will permit me to say a word about his services here. I wish to say in behalf of the service of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] that he entered this House with me in the Sixty-fifth Congress. The other day, on April 2, he finished here his seventeenth continuous year of valuable and efficient service.

The general interest in his hour's speech today is manifested by the fact that 30 minutes was yielded to him by the minority side from across the aisle. I think he is one of the most valuable men in the House, and I know that I express the sentiment of the House when I say that no man in the United States knows more about river and harbor work than he does. [Applause.]

Every Member of the House is his friend, and he has the confidence and respect and esteem of the whole body.

I remember when I was a boy, some of the happiest days I ever spent was when I lived in a county in his district. In hunting deer and fox with hounds I used to know every cow trail between La Grange and Columbus, where he lives. I hope he will serve here with the same valuable service that he has given in the past for many years to come. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank my colleague. I will now yield to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. It is a great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to be entirely in accord once in a while with our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. I would not expect the gentleman from Massachusetts to be entirely in accord with me only occasionally. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. I could not be and retain my reputation at home. [Laughter.] But when he speaks of my good friend Mr. MANSFIELD, the Chairman of the Committee



on Rivers and Harbors, with such praise, I heartily coincide with him.

I only want to add a word. No matter what the record of 15 or 20 years ago may say, the actual fact is that there was a desire to create another committee to take care of some ambitious men who wanted positions. That is the history of the whole set-up of the Flood Control Committee, and I do not think that such jurisdiction should have been taken away from the Rivers and Harbors Committee as was done at that time. As I said, I served years ago on the committee when Mr. Sparkman, of Florida, was Chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and now we have as efficient and fine a chairman as Mr. Sparkman was at that time in the person of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and my colleague [Mr. BLANTON] for the compliments they have paid me.

Mr. Madison was denominated the "Father of the Constitution", but his rigid construction of it in this regard has long since failed to be sustained by the courts and by the people. Congress failed to override the veto by the necessary two-thirds majority, though on the roll call in the House there were 60 yeas and 56 nays. It is a notable fact that Clay, Webster, Calhoun, and William Henry Harrison all voted to override the veto, Mr. Clay being the Speaker of the House at the time. Mr. Webster was then a Member of the House from the State of New Hampshire, and William Henry Harrison, afterward President, was then a Representative from Ohio.

In 1832 Andrew Jackson vetoed a bill containing waterway and other improvements. In his message he said:

It is obvious that such appropriations involve the sanctity of a principle that concedes to the General Government an unlimited power over the subject of internal improvements, and that I could not, therefore, approve a bill containing them without receding from the position taken in my veto of the Maysville road bill, and afterward in my annual message of December 7, 1830.

In the annual message referred to by Mr. Jackson he drew a distinction between bills for internal improvements, considering some as of national scope, while others he denominated as local. Several bills for river and harbor improvements were approved by him as of national scope, and the bill meeting with his veto passed Congress by the necessary majorities. On March 3, 1837, the last day of Mr. Jackson's term as President, he approved a general river and harbor bill appropriating \$1,666,722, the largest river and harbor bill ever passed by Congress up to that time.

In 1854 and 1856 several bills for internal improvement, embracing waterways, were vetoed by Franklin Pierce, whose views upon the constitutionality of such measures were similar to those of Mr. Jackson. All of the bills vetoed, with one exception, were passed by the necessary majorities. He also approved several bills for waterway improvements as not coming within the scope of his objections.

Mr. Pierce, in his message of December 30, 1854, makes reference to President John Quincy Adams, which is quite interesting. It is as follows:

President John Quincy Adams, in claiming on one occasion, after his retirement from office, the authorship of the idea of introducing into the administration of the affairs of the General Government a pertinent and regular system of internal improvements, speaks of it as a system by which the whole Union would have been checkered over with railroads and canals affording high wages and constant employment to hundreds of thousands of laborers, and he places it in express contrast with the construction of such work by the legislation of the State and by private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if those views are entertained by the statesmen representing Massachusetts at this time.

The first general river and harbor bill to be vetoed was by President Arthur in 1882. The bill carried appropriations of more than \$18,000,000, which Mr. Arthur thought was excessive and more than the Treasury could bear. He stated that he would have approved a bill for half the amount. The bill passed over his veto by more than the necessary two-thirds majority. In the Senate Ransom, Sherman, Vest, Voorhees, Windom, Allison, Aldrich, Coke,

Gorman, Hoar, Kellogg, and Pugh were among those who voted "yea." Several river and harbor bills were approved by Mr. Arthur.

In 1896 a river and harbor bill was vetoed by President Cleveland. This was in the last year of his second administration. He had previously approved all river and harbor bills presented to him, but this measure he denominated as "so extravagant as to be especially unsuited to these times of depressed business and resulting disappointment in Government revenue."

It will be borne in mind that this was soon after the Supreme Court had declared the income tax law unconstitutional, and the Government was shorn of a large proportion of its revenues. Mr. Cleveland's motto was "rigid economy" in times of depression. The bill was passed over his veto, Bankhead, Burton, Cannon, Champ Clark, Culberson, Cummings, Gillette, Grosvenor, McMillan, and Underwood voting yea.

Since 1896, no river and harbor bill has been vetoed, and the Chief Executives have shown a friendly interest in navigation improvements. President Theodore Roosevelt has been the outstanding President of all time for the improvement of inland waters. His message in 1903, in transmitting the report of the Inland Waterways Commission, can truthfully be said to be the beginning of the renaissance of river transportation in the United States.

No President of the United States has ever expressed antipathy to waterway improvements by the Federal Government, except upon constitutional or economic grounds. From George Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt, both included, every President, with the possible exception of William Henry Harrison and James A. Garfield, has approved measures in aid of navigation. William Henry Harrison served as President for only 30 days, and Mr. Garfield for only a few months. I know of no measure of the kind being presented to them during their short tenures. Mr. Harrison was one of those who voted to override the veto of Mr. Madison. It is a reasonable certainty he would have approved such a bill, if given the opportunity. Mr. Garfield voted for such measures when a Member of Congress.

Mr. Madison, who in 1817, for constitutional reasons, vetoed a bill for internal improvements embracing canals, did not hesitate the year before to approve a bill for light-houses, buoys, and beacons, as aids to commerce and navigation. In the face of the unbroken record of our Presidents, from the first to the latest, in the improvement of waterways, who will presume to condemn such measures? To such contender I should be pleased to reply in the language attributed by Shakespeare to Brutus: "If any, speak; for him have I offended." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 1 minute more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman very much. I have here volume XIV, no. 2, of the Annals of Congress of 1816-17, containing the bill vetoed by Mr. Madison and his veto message, with the record vote in the House showing Mr. Webster, Mr. Clay, Mr. Calhoun, Mr. William Henry Harrison, voting to override the veto, and here is a note at the bottom in parenthesis:

(It will be observed that the Speaker [Mr. Clay] on this occasion, differing from all other questions before the House, claimed and exercised the right to vote.)

That is the only instance where he did it as Speaker. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, during the past week there has been quite a bit of discussion in reference to the rules of the House with regard to a petition to discharge a committee from further consideration of a bill by the signatures

of 145 Members to such a petition. I call attention to the rule as adopted on Tuesday, December 8, 1931, and quote from Mr. Pou, who was then Chairman of the Committee on Rules:

Mr. Speaker, 31 years ago I was a Member of this House under what I may term a "one-man oligarchy." For 10 years following my entrance into the House, the House of Representatives had tied itself, hand and foot, and delivered itself to the Speaker. The House was under the control of a Committee on Rules, composed of three men—the Speaker, a gentleman from his side of the House, and one man from the minority side.

This discharge rule provides for the discharge of committees under certain circumstances. It even provides for the discharge of the Committee on Rules. I have no objection to that. As long as I am at the head of the Rules Committee there is not going to be any sitting on the lid. [Applause.] I am willing at any time if any gentleman thinks the Rules Committee is attempting to stifle legislation to have you put your discharge rule into operation. This is also what the proposed change does with respect to other committees.

I may say that this matter will be discussed in detail by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Crisp, and perhaps by other gentlemen on this side. The Crisp discharge rule also provides in another paragraph for the calling together of committees where the chairman refuses to call the committee together. Surely nobody objects to this.

Another provision of the Crisp rule is that providing for action by the conferees when they refused to act. Surely nobody can object to that. There are the three high spots in the Crisp amendment to the rules of the House—the discharge of committees, the calling of committees together and compelling the conferees to act.

A good deal has been said about amendments to this Crisp amendment to the rules. We are willing to stand or fall by the action taken by the Democratic caucus. I believe an overwhelming majority of the House is in favor of the proposed liberalization of the rules.

Mr. Crisp then made the following remarks, and I want to say here that I am not reading all the remarks that were said, so that I am not trying in any way to deceive the House in the statements made by Mr. Pou or Mr. Crisp, for whom I have the highest regard. I quote:

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this is the day I long have looked forward to—a Democratic Speaker, this House under Democratic rule, carrying out the great principles of democracy, that a majority shall rule, and the adoption of rules with sufficient authority and so adjusted that they shall be rules for the entire House—not to meet any political exigency of any party, but to insure the fundamental right of democracy, that a majority of the House may work its will under the terms of those rules. [Applause.]

The rules that are presented here today are exactly the rules, word for word, that were presented by me in the last Congress and debated with the distinguished majority leader on the floor of the House with only one change. The number that is required to initiate a motion to discharge being changed from 100, as originally written, to 145.

I determined to evolve, to the very best of my ability, a rule that could not be filibustered, that could not be circumvented, giving the House a chance to discharge a committee and put a bill on its passage; and the second method in this rule which you have before you today will absolutely accomplish that purpose.

Now, I would like especially to stress to my friends of the press that 145 does not discharge a committee. The opponents of this rule say that that 145 would permit unbaked legislation. Such is not the case. The 145 is simply the number necessary to initiate the right for the House itself to vote twice a month as to whether or not it will discharge a committee. To discharge a committee it would be necessary to have a majority of the membership of the House voting, a quorum being present. As this rule can only come up 2 days in a month, the motion to discharge will have to be on the calendar 7 days, and the membership of the House will know it, will be here, and, in my judgment, it will always require 200 or more voting in the affirmative to discharge a committee, but it is within the power of the 145 to put the House on record.

I welcome the minority's program. I hope you will propose one. This rule gives you an opportunity to do so. If it is like your programs in the past, I am quite willing to vote against it, and our majority will vote against it, and yet you can have your record known to the country.

That is all these rules will do. They are democratic. They put it in the power of the majority of this House to carry out its will, whether that majority is made up of Democrats, Progressives, Republicans, or any other party. These rules are made in keeping with the spirit of democracy, in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution of the United States that the majority may rule; and with these rules there can be no hue and cry throughout the land that the House of Representatives is gagged by a triumvirate. [Applause.]

I shall also quote a statement by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]:

Today, after 22 years, thanks to the Democratic majority, we again have a chance and an opportunity to liberalize the rules and to relieve the membership from the extremely restrictive and established rulings which have been in effect the last 10 years of Republican rule.

To me, who continually demanded the liberalization of these rules, it is a great satisfaction that we are about to protect the Members in their rights and privileges so long denied them. For not only was the House often at the mercy of the Speaker but also at the mercy of the conferees and of the various chairmen of the committee.

On the vote on this rule there were 227 yeas and 193 nays. Practically all the Democrats voted for the rule. In this connection, let me remind you that Mr. BYRNS, the majority leader of the House, during the past week has severely criticized the fact that this rule was detrimental to the orderly functioning of the House, claiming that it interfered with the right of those in charge of legislation and that it is an obstacle to legislation rather than an aid to it; and a way is being sought to prevent these rules from coming up for discussion on the floor of the House.

I, myself, am convinced that if our Constitution is to survive we must have party government, and the party must be responsible for its acts in order that it may function to the best interests of the American people. The other day I was interrogated by the majority leader as to my attitude in reference to this rule and I made the statement that I voted against the rule in 1931 because I thought it was wrong and that I would vote to support a change of the rule because I am firmly convinced that party government should function properly if we do not want to establish some form of government in this country that will weaken our Constitution and make us an inferior Government of a one-man rule, or set up a dictatorship, and I am opposed to any dictatorship.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. McDUFFIE. How much support could we expect from the gentleman's side were we to bring up the question of amending this rule?

Mr. RICH. I may say that if we as American citizens under the present condition of our country would do those things we in our own minds and consciences feel are for the best interest of the country we would not play politics; and if we did not play politics then I think that the majority of the Republicans who, at the time this vote was taken, opposed that rule should vote for its modification.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I agree with the gentleman, but unfortunately the Republican Party sometimes plays politics.

Mr. RICH. I do not think the Republican Party is nearly as much inclined to play politics as is the Democratic Party, because during the time I have been here, since 1930, I have seen little but politics played on the Democratic side of the House. This statement I am sorry I have to make. A great many of the laws that have been enacted at this session of the Congress will rise up to damn the Democratic Party, for they can never explain the operations of those laws to the satisfaction of their constituents and the country at large.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Of course the Democratic Party will speak for itself at the proper time.

Mr. RICH. The members of that party certainly will have to, for the responsibility is theirs.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Certainly; and we want the responsibility.

I am in entire accord with the gentleman's views with regard to the rule. I think it is the most asinine thing the House has ever done. I asked the gentleman how much support we could expect from his side, but I failed to find out from him if there were gentlemen on that side who are ready to join those of us on this side who wish to act for the benefit of orderly procedure by amending this rule.

Mr. RICH. In connection with the gentleman's statement that this was an asinine rule, the gentleman himself voted for it.



Mr. McDUFFIE. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not vote for it.

Mr. RICH. I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 8, 1931. On the roll call appearing at page 82, there were 227 yeas recorded for the rule and one of the Members recorded as voting "yea" is Mr. McDUFFIE. I presume that means the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is my name. I dislike to challenge the RECORD, but I opposed the rule in caucus and have opposed it ever since it was first suggested. Even if I did vote for it [laughter]—and I now have no recollection of having done so, and I do not believe I did so.

Those of us who have seen its operation, being anxious to preserve the welfare of this side of the legislative branch of the Government wish to see the rule amended. May I ask the gentleman frankly if he thinks we could get support from his side to do away with this rule?

Mr. RICH. I certainly admire the gentleman's attitude. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Alabama. I have always come to the conclusion in my life that a wise man changes his mind and a fool never. When you find out that you did something wrong you ought to right a wrong. So far as the Republican Party, the minority Members on this side are concerned, I can speak for only one Member. I may say that I have never been tied down by anybody for anything. I have never made a promise of any kind to anybody, and I do not intend to unless I think within my own mind and conscience that it is the right thing. I can assure the gentleman that I will secure all the votes that I can from Republicans to help amend this rule.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman is a very rare Republican.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. It is quite possible that the gentleman from Alabama may have voted one way in the caucus but was bound by the caucus in voting in the House, which the RECORD shows.

Mr. RICH. I may say in that connection that the members of the Democratic Party are putting through legislation that they do not know what they are voting for. In connection with the Taylor bill that we had here last week they were like a bunch of sheep trying to put through section 13 which was added to the bill. The Committee on Public Lands knew nothing about the section. The only men that knew anything about section 13 was Mr. Wallace of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Ickes of the Department of the Interior, and Mr. DeRouen, chairman of the committee. The committee never had an opportunity to discuss section 13, and because the chairman of the committee stated that it ought to be enacted into law why they filed down from this side of the House and put that section to the bill when it was detrimental to the members of the Democratic Party and they will find that out later. We should have stated to the departments who should be responsible for administering the grazing on public lands.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman, in the course of his remarks, accused the Democrats of playing politics and the Republicans of not doing so.

Mr. RICH. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman inferred that we played politics. I am willing to admit the gentleman is right; we do play politics on the Democratic side, but it is playing politics for the people; and when 145 Representatives of the people want to get action on a bill they should be entitled to get that action.

Mr. RICH. I do not say that the Democratic Party are the only ones that play politics. I am sorry to admit that too much politics is played by both parties; but I would say the Democrats are past masters in the art.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, no attitude, of his many attitudes, since he assumed the high and solemn duties of Chief Executive and savior of this Nation and its peoples, since he demanded—and received—the despotic power in which today he is clothed, has so disappointed me, and, I venture, has so disappointed his other friends, his supporters, and the millions who have found their hope for the future and their patience for the present in the vibrant promises of "the more abundant life", the "good neighbor", the "scourging of the money changers from the temple", as Mr. Roosevelt's attitude, as announced by the press, concerning the proposal in the McLeod bill to restore to the rightful owners nearly two billions of deposits now frozen in the closed banks of America, in part, by the direct action of the President.

According to reports of a conference held on the day of his return from his vacation by the Chief Executive with Washington press correspondents, the President in a somewhat jesting manner disposed of the proposal for the Government to take over the assets of the closed banks, restore to the rightful owners of the deposits frozen in those banks, that money they so desperately need.

In that jestful moment Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of these United States, hope of a desperate and fearful populace, wielder of the most autocratic power ever vested in a Chief Executive of this Nation, literal possessor of despotic power over the fortunes, the possessions, the health, almost the very lives of one hundred and twenty-five millions of people, in the greatest Nation of former freemen ever devised by the mind of man, in that moment, I say, he disposed of the hopes of millions of desperate, want-ridden, gaunt, and agonized men, women, and children whose all, impounded, by order of the President, in banks which they believed, and had a right to believe, were safe and sound, remains today impounded. Impounded, if you please, while bank officers, conservators, receivers, and receivers' attorneys are reaping rich salaries being paid out of the assets of those closed banks, the while the rightful owners of those moneys can get no word, no tidings of what is being done with and to their savings.

Nearly two billions of money belonging to citizens of this Republic remain frozen by order of the President in these closed banks and in banks closed before the Executive action. That nearly two billions of money withheld from the owners thereof represents the self-denial, the lifelong toil, the careful saving, the intelligent thrift, the sweat and sacrifice of millions of our citizens. In that nearly two billions of frozen deposits are imprisoned the present and the future welfare of widows, orphans, of aged and aging men and women who have saved for a lifetime so that as the sun of their mortal day sinks slowly but surely toward the western horizon, and the twilight of advancing years gently settles over their silvered heads they might know peace, security, freedom from the fear that they might have to eat the bitter bread of charity.

Imprisoned in the icy folds of those bank-frozen billions are the insurance funds, the savings, the investments left as the tokens of tenderest love by departed fathers and mothers who planned and saved and strove and sacrificed that the gentle touch of their affection might remain as they journeyed forth into the vastness of an unknown eternity to bless their loved ones left here waving them a tearful adieu on their journey from the shores of mortal experience.

Why, Mr. Chairman, thousands of those citizens, whose funds are thus frozen in the banks, are in the pitiful bread lines which wind their slow and tortuous course each day to the soup kitchens.

Why, sir, thousands of those citizens who believed, and rightfully believed, they had saved and sacrificed successfully to attain a competence for their old age are today eating the bitter bread of charity.

Millions of those citizens, Mr. Chairman, are dragging their weary days out in the midst of stark tragedy, agony of mind, long and countless nights of fitful tossing in fear

and desperation, wondering how they will fare in the future, with their all held in the icy clasp of frozen bank deposits. Who, sir, can venture to gage the depths of human agony, fear, and tragedy into which these millions of citizens, through no fault of their own, were plunged by a stroke of the President's pen when he closed the banks of America? Who, sir, can explain to these millions of citizens that the banks were closed by the President "to protect and conserve", as he declared at the time, "the deposits in the banks for their owners", and yet answer their pitiful plea as to why their deposits, instead of being conserved to them, are being slowly but surely consumed in the salaries and expenses of the conservators? Who, sir, can explain to them why it is that, while the deposits of other citizens are now guaranteed by this Government, they, and they alone, must pay the fearful price of poverty and reap the starkly tragic toll of gaunt want?

Who, Mr. Chairman, can explain on any grounds of justice, economic expediency, or good neighborliness to those tragic victims of the closed banks, why it is that we must pour out billions to the railroads, that their bad investments may be liquidated; to insurance companies, to employees in the forests, to everybody; the young, the able, the robust, the banker in his mahogany offices, the railroad official in his palatial quarters, the P.W.A., the C.W.A., the C.C.C., the A.A.A., but yet blast the hopes and refuse the pleas of millions, a large percentage of whom are aged, gray, unable longer to toil, unable longer to meet the struggles in a selfish world?

Who, Mr. Chairman, among us here today can venture to gage the measure of hurt to the hearts of these millions of Americans, as the President's refusal to relieve the most fearful tragedy of their lives rings in their ears? Who, sir, can venture here today to measure the depth of the wound sent by that refusal into the very quivering souls of millions of America's best men and women, and defenseless children—victims of a Presidential order which imprisoned their all in the icy grip of frozen assets—and without a word of explanation, has kept that all so imprisoned?

Those frozen deposits, Mr. Chairman, are the tragic summation of crushing misfortune to millions of good Americans.

Those frozen assets may not have seemed tragic to the President, but they are the ever-present specter of hunger, want, humiliation, and starvation to thousands and thousands of the finest type of citizenship ever produced in this "home of the brave and land of the free." God save the mark!

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. As I understood the gentleman's statement he said that it would require about \$2,000,000,000 to liquidate these deposits.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Approximately that, I understand.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does that include deposits in banks that are nonmembers of the Federal Reserve System?

Mr. WOODRUFF. That will, of course, depend entirely on the form of the bill as it becomes law. I may say that the original McLeod bill provided that the entire amount of deposits in national banks should be paid depositors. That in itself, I understand, would approximate \$2,000,000,000. Ninety-six and one half percent of the depositors with money frozen in closed banks are made up of those with \$2,500 or less in those banks.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Can the gentleman give an estimate of how much will be required to take care of the deposits in nonmember banks?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am of the opinion that if the bill is amended to pay in full deposits in both national and State banks not in excess of \$2,500, graduating the amount above that which shall be paid, that \$2,000,000,000, or approximately that sum, will be necessary.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. As the author of the bill which has been substituted in the Banking and Currency Committee for the McLeod bill, I may say that Mr. PRALL, chairman of the subcommittee, has an estimate that the cost would be about \$700,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am very happy to have that statement from my colleague from Michigan and I thank him for his contribution to this discussion, and hope he is correct, although I seriously doubt the accuracy of the prediction of the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill.

Those frozen assets—nearly two billions of them, sir—may seem but an incident of depression to some, but those impounded deposits are the epitome of human grief and fear and tragedy to millions of our finest types of men and women in America. Who, I repeat, can venture to measure the wound to them in the attitude of the President toward their dire misfortune and their stark want?

"I'm a tough guy. I learned things from the sharks and barracudas." So spoke the President to the delegation of adoring Members of the Congress and the Marine Band, glorious in crimson, as they met him at the railroad station. And one almost wonders, Mr. Chairman, whether there was in that remark, more than the mere jocularity of an idle jest made in a moment of exuberance, upon finding a delegation of adoring admirers awaiting with a band in crimson and gold. One wonders, when one ponders that refusal of a few hours later the same day, crushing the last hope of millions of fear-stricken and want-ridden victims of the closed banks. Truly the art of so lightly dismissing the hopes, the fears, the agony, and the tragedy of millions of American men, women, and children might well have been learned from the sharks and the barracudas.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have been more profoundly disappointed by this attitude of Franklin Delano Roosevelt than I have at anything that has happened in American life and affairs since he has been the Chief Executive. I believe the President's closest and most loyal admirers must be disappointed as I am.

When I ponder the high, idealistic, warm, human, protestations of Mr. Roosevelt, his assurances of protecting the weak against the strong, his promises that the money changers should be driven from the temple, his vibrant voicing of the philosophy of the good neighbor, his solemn declaration that he was closing the banks to conserve the deposits for their rightful owners, his demands for autocratic power that he might see that even-handed justice was dispensed to every individual of this great Nation, his further demands for more power and still more power—which this Congress has readily and willingly, aye, eagerly granted him—I say, when I ponder those facts, when I recall the noble sentiments he expressed outside this historic edifice in his inaugural address, the beautiful prayer to Almighty God which crowned so fittingly the expression of such noble sentiments—I find myself utterly unable to reconcile his refusal to relieve the misery, the fears, the want, the privation, the bitter humiliation of millions of our finest men and women and children of this land. To me it is an utterly incomprehensible reversal of everything Franklin Delano Roosevelt has voiced in the past, everything he has claimed to stand for, everything he has typified to a Nation whose citizens today still stand on the perilous edge of a yawning precipice, into the darkness and social chaos of which a thrust, the like of that which the President has made into the hearts and the hopes of millions of Americans, might easily plunge us.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in the person of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, into his keeping, because of the high spiritual ideals he has voiced, the high spiritual promises he has made, are centered the hopes of this people; to him is confided the greatest, most despotic, most autocratic power ever vested in any individual in any high office since this land was wrested from the greedy grasp of an absentee ruler and, through the blood and agony of our fathers, molded into the greatest social organization, under the greatest charter of human rights—the Constitution—ever devised by man. And I want to say also that the hope, the con-



fidence, the idealistic adoration which has been given to this man, along with this despotic power, if shattered by misguided or mistaken decisions may well result in social chaos and serious consequences. America has been patient, sir. Our people have been long suffering and majestic in their exercise of self-control. They have believed the promises of Mr. Roosevelt. To them he is their champion, their savior, their hope, and I warn this Congress and this country that that hope, that confidence, that—I am tempted to say—idolatry of the President by our people is something not to be trifled with, not to be endangered, not to be treated lightly. America cannot suffer another loss of confidence in her leaders and survive social disorder.

This question, Mr. Chairman, is not one merely of sentiment. This question, sir, is not one which can be settled and dismissed on the basis of granting or of refusing a favor. The issues here involved are fundamental issues of government, of moral responsibility, of sheer justice, and this question has not been and cannot be settled by Mr. Roosevelt, or by any other official nor by any group of officials, until it has been settled rightly, justly, equitably, and decently.

That the Government does have resting upon it a profound moral obligation to restore these billions of dollars to the rightful owners, no man can justly deny.

Why, sir, have we so soon forgotten the hymn of hate which swept the press of this country for 2 years previous to Mr. Roosevelt's inauguration against the so-called "hoarders"? The Government officials, from Mr. Hoover down, pleaded, demanded, threatened, cajoled the people to cease withdrawing their money from the banks, to take their money out of hiding, and put it in the banks. Mr. Hoover himself assured the people the banks were sound. Mr. Coolidge, then ex-President, in a scathing denunciation of so-called "hoarders", demanded that, as a part of good citizenship, as a part of patriotism, the people should put their money in the banks, and should keep their money in the banks. The Secretary of the Treasury and innumerable other officials of the Treasury and other departments of the Government gave out interviews in the press, over the radio, in every way by which the people might be reached; Government officials, bankers, editors, industrialists—all demanded, on the grounds of good citizenship, on the grounds of patriotism, that the citizens should keep their money in these banks, which were declared over and over again to be sound. Why, sir, that drive, that campaign, to force the citizens to put their money into banks reached a crescendo comparable to the war-time drive in the sale of Liberty bonds. So-called "hoarders" were branded as slackers.

It was proposed in this Congress and was urged by some Government officials that an act be passed making it a crime punishable by heavy fine and imprisonment for anybody to voice or to whisper or to even hint that any banking institution might not be as sound as the Rock of Gibraltar. Those facts are not buried in the mists and hysteria of a war time of nearly two decades ago. They are facts of less than 3 years ago. They are facts of yesterday, and they cannot be dismissed by a jest by the President or by anybody else.

What was the true situation while this hymn of hate, this campaign of villification, this deluge of ridicule, this avalanche of demands by Government officials and others was beating about the heads of the citizens. Why, sir, in those very days, when Government officials were demanding, pleading, threatening, cajoling the citizens to have faith in the banks—in those very days, I say, those banks were unsound—and the Government officials knew it. Those banks were issuing false statements—and the Government officials knew it. We have since learned through the testimony of the Government officials themselves that bank inspectors were being instructed to permit banks to operate, to accept deposits, to make false reports, when those banks were known to be insolvent. Those are the facts, sir, and they cannot be waved aside.

O Mr. Chairman, it will be of no avail to say that a Republican administration was in power when that was

done! Those officials were Government officials, not merely Republican officials, just as Franklin Delano Roosevelt is the Chief Executive of all the people, not merely of the Democrats. It will be of no avail, I say, to try to befog this issue by partisan political arguments. Democrats, Republicans, men of all parties, men of all creeds, helped to carry on that campaign to force the people to put their money in the banks. Officials, laymen, pulpit, press—they all urged that governmental supervision of the national banks, that Federal Reserve supervision of member banks, that State supervision of State banks—were the guaranties that the banks were sound. Members of Congress of both political parties, clearing-house associations—all assured these citizens who now fill the bread lines, who are now pauperized, who now are losing their homes, who now are living out their days in the agony of a base betrayal which has frozen their money in locked banks—that the banks were safe. And, in those very hours, Government officials knew—mark you that statement—Government officials knew, banking officials knew, clearing-house authorities knew that many of those banks were unsound, unsafe! They knew then that the legend, "national bank", spread in gold letters across the front of many financial institutions as the guaranty of strict governmental supervision and of soundness, were a falsity and a hollow mockery. Those facts cannot be denied.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does the gentleman mean to say that Government officials knew as a fact that these banks were unsound? Was not the situation that it was a period during which there was great uncertainty as to values, when it was practically impossible to determine what the value of bank paper was, because no man in the world could determine whether the man who made the paper or the corporation back of it was solvent or insolvent, and that what the Government officials did was merely to give the banks the benefit of the doubt?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; I mean to say Government officials did know banks were unsound. I recognize the fact that there were mitigating circumstances, that those were perilous times in this country, and banking was of uncertain stability, but, nevertheless, in spite of all the things the gentleman states, it is a matter of record before committees of Congress that the statements I have made are true; and may I remind the gentleman that no matter what the banking situation was, and no matter what combination of circumstances may seem to justify Government officials misleading the people of this country, the depositors were not to blame. We cannot charge them with any part of this responsibility.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I do not believe the gentleman should put into the Record a statement charging the Government with responsibility, either.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is a matter of opinion only.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The truth of the matter is, of course, that hindsight is always better than foresight. During that period it was often impossible to determine the value of the assets of a bank. Mistakes were made. Instead of working out of the economic depression and effecting a recovery, we went in deeper; but there was no man in the world who could have anticipated it at that time.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman says mistakes were made. Were the mistakes made by the depositors who believed these Government officials and who because of their belief either left their money in the banks or returned it to the banks.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The mistake was made both by the depositors and by Government officials.

Mr. WOODRUFF. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he approves the loans that have been made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the banks, to the railroads, and to the insurance companies?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. To make a direct answer to the question would require a statement that would be too sweeping.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am not asking a question that requires a speech in response. I am asking the gentleman for a "yes" or "no" answer. Does the gentleman believe that the loans to the banks, to the railroads, and to the insurance companies have been justified?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I submit that the gentleman's question does not permit of a "yes" or "no" answer. Some of the loans were justified and some may not have been justified. I am, of course, not personally familiar with the details of all the loans.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Without doubt, if the bill I am discussing should become law, the assets in some banks would more than pay the depositors of those banks. The assets of other banks would not be sufficient for this purpose. Loans—because after all that is what the proposed payments amount to—would be both good and bad, as have been the loans the gentleman refers to.

There seems to be no hesitancy on the part of the present administration to continue to meet such demands as seem necessary from the banks, the railroads, and the insurance companies for loans to them. I am not criticizing this policy. I do not want the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CHRISTIANSON] or anyone else to gather from what I am saying that I consider the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as being anything other than necessary. I do not want the gentleman to mistake me on that; but I disagree with the gentleman, I can see, about this matter. Inasmuch as we have made loans to these business organizations, and inasmuch as necessarily there must be, in due course of time, losses connected with those loans, and as a result of those loans, and as the question involved in this proposal to pay the depositors is nothing more or less than a loan extended on security—not the best, perhaps, but on security—and as we have some justification for some degree of optimism as to the future of this country, we have reason to expect that during the better days to come these securities, which today do not have the value we may wish they might have, will acquire a value which will make the loss to the Government comparatively small as a result of such loans.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does the gentleman believe, then, in view of the Securities Regulation Act of 1933, that if the Government should hold out to investors the belief or the hope that certain securities are good, and this in fact should turn out not to be the fact, for that reason the Federal Government would be assuming a responsibility to reimburse these investors?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman would beguile me from a further discussion of the matter to which I am directing my remarks. He is opening up new avenues of discussion which neither time nor inclination will permit me to follow. The question he raises is not included in the matter before us.

To now resume the tenor of my remarks, the moral responsibility of this Government—notwithstanding what my friend from Minnesota has had to say—with respect to these millions of citizens whose all is frozen in the closed banks is there. It cannot justly be evaded. It cannot be waved aside. Until the grievous wrong done these millions of good citizens is righted these facts will stand as the record of the basest betrayal of the people by their Government and their leaders that ever blotched and smutted the pages of this great Republic.

The action proposed in the McLeod bill or the Brown bill, I will say to my colleague from Michigan, if that bill is the one finally enacted, is not to make a gift to these people.

It is not a measure to pay lobster losses or private debts. It is a measure of rightful restitution to these citizens of what is justly theirs; of money which officials of this Government helped to lure into banks which they knew were unsound; banks which the Government was charged with the responsibility of seeing were sound—a responsibility that was basely and wantonly betrayed and evaded. And again, I say, sir, that responsibility, that moral duty, to restore to these despoiled millions of citizens the money that is rightfully theirs cannot be finally disposed of until justice is done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. RICH. How would the gentleman suggest that the Government take over the assets of all these banks that have failed, when some have been partly liquidated and the good assets sold? Does the gentleman think that the taxpayers of this country should come in and assume the responsibility of the burdens that might be placed upon them because of the desire of Members of Congress to have the Government pay all of these deposits?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I assume, I will say to my friend from Pennsylvania, that if he has been listening to my remarks, he must have long ago come to the conclusion that I am in favor of just that. The taxpayers will find it necessary to provide the funds with which to pay the losses on the loans of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. They must eventually pay the expenses and the expenditures of all the different alphabetical activities now being indulged in. The largest eventual loss to the Treasury which so far as I know has been predicted as a result of this legislation is \$300,000,000, the exact sum of the first appropriation for the C.C.C. That appropriation assisted 300,000 young men and their families. This legislation would extend needed relief to 10,000,000 worthy men and women, and through them to those dependent upon them.

Turning for a moment to the economic side of this grave and portentous question, I ask by what process of reasoning anyone can arrive at the conclusion that two billions of frozen bank deposits, if released, would not contribute just as much to renewed purchasing power of our people as two billions handed to the railroads, as two billions handed to banksters, as two billions spent in public works, as two billions spent in reforestation, and in the C.W.A.? Mark you, sir, I am not decrying these various efforts at national economic rehabilitation! I am asking by what process of reasoning two billions, or nearly two billions of dollars now frozen in bank deposits, if released, can be considered as of less value in aiding restoration of purchasing power in America than the two billions here and the two billions there, and the two billions yonder, being poured out in such unstinted measure by the President in efforts to increase purchasing power and restore prosperity.

I have said I am profoundly disappointed by the President's attitude toward the money belonging to millions of good Americans now locked in the icy grip of frozen bank deposits, the while icy fear grips at the hearts of bereft men and women. This is so grave that it goes beyond any personal criticism of merely an individual. Franklin Delano Roosevelt is not merely an individual. By the very force of circumstances, by his very promises, by the very desperation of this Nation and its peoples, he cannot for one single moment be merely an individual. Not one word, not one act, not one wave of his hand, not one chuckle of his can be merely individual. He typifies the hope, the salvation, the bulwark against ruin and social chaos, to the American people. Therefore, he should—and must—weigh every word, every chuckle, every gesture, by that measure. Not for one minute of one hour of his days can he be merely an individual.

He assumed, and willingly, the role of savior of this country, champion of the oppressed, guarantor of even justice to all. He wanted to be the knight in armor who would joust with the dragon of ruin and disorder, and with his lance of high ideals and purposes strengthened by autocratic power, asked for by him and given to him by this Congress, representing a sorely oppressed people, slay that monstrous menace of want and riot and revolution. He must weigh his words and gestures; he must chart his course and consider his acts accordingly. More than any other individual in this land, more than any official in this Republic, more than all of us here, perhaps, he holds and wields the power for good or ill to this Nation in his words, his gestures, his attitudes, his states of mind.

In all fairness, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that as I recall the vibrant expressions of high spiritual purposes sent ringing broadcast through this land time and again, sent



through medium of linotype and printing press, sent through the avenue of a book, by the President, I simply cannot believe Mr. Roosevelt could have meant to jest about the stark tragedy wrought in the lives of millions of our best citizens by those frozen bank deposits. I want to say, frankly and fairly, that I can find the only explanation of Mr. Roosevelt's amazing and unbelievable attitude and expressions concerning this tragic matter in his recent vacation and his return to the adulation of a congressional delegation, the martial strains of "Hail to the Chief"; it must have been that in the exuberance of it all this kindly man, who has voiced so many beautiful and noble sentiments, whose concern, as expressed by him, has been always for the lowly and the stricken—it must have been that he forgot for the moment his high destiny, the high place he holds in the hearts of his countrymen, the vast power for good or ill he wields, the stark and fearful tragedy today engulfing millions of citizens whose all is denied them behind the doors of locked banks. He must for the moment have forgotten. No other explanation of this amazing and disheartening change of sentiment can I find.

But, sir, whether it was in a moment of exuberance, whether it was in a moment of trying to be merely an individual, the terrible fact remains that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, by one airy wave of his hand, damned the McLeod bill; and in that same instant he damned the hopes and confirmed the fears and fastened more tightly the nooses of tragedy, hunger, lost homes, bitter charity, fear, agony, sleepless nights about the lives of millions of America's best men and women. I cannot but feel that the President owes it to these millions of betrayed and ruined depositors to unsay what he has said, to reconsider his decision, to withdraw his objections to the McLeod bill.

But one conclusion can be reached about the tactics employed by the committee of this House in charge of the McLeod bill. It is that the committee fears to give the Congress, the peoples' representatives, a chance to vote on the proposal. Added to that now the President's words and attitude damn irretrievably the hopes of these millions of American men and women getting their money, unless Mr. Roosevelt changes his views expressed on that fateful Friday the 13th. It cannot be that he means to turn his back upon these pleading millions—pleading for the restoration of that which is rightfully theirs. It must be the President will see this matter in a more kindly vein and will send the word to this Congress to give the peoples' representatives a chance to vote on the McLeod measure. If he does not, if he persists in his refusal to right one of this Nation's most terrible tragedies, then America's idol has fallen and the people are, indeed, bereft of hope. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require, not exceeding an hour.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, our committee has brought you one of the best appropriation bills for the District of Columbia that has been before the Congress for several years.

While we have tried to eliminate all waste and extravagance and opportunity for graft, and have reduced it \$817,761 below the President's Budget estimates, we have nevertheless granted to the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year the sum of \$2,261,248.94 more than it received for the present fiscal year.

I feel sure that I express the sentiment of all of the Members of this House when I say that we cannot say too much in praise of the splendid work our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, has diligently and efficiently performed in its careful preparation. He devoted to it weeks of study and consideration. During the tedious days he spent in holding the hearings, he was patient and courteous, yet firm and exacting, in seeing to it that no stone was left unturned in bringing to light all pertinent information. All of us regret exceedingly that the injuries he received in the unfortunate automobile accident prevent him from handling this bill on the floor, and we wish for him a speedy recovery.

[Applause.] CLARENCE CANNON is one of the ablest parliamentarians in this House. I deem him one of the most valuable Members we have in Congress. I consider it an honor to serve under him on this subcommittee. I wish that he were here to take charge of his own bill.

I want also to commend our good friends, new Members, Mr. JACOBSEN, of Iowa, Mr. DITTER, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. POWERS, of New Jersey, who have done splendid work. I think that this bill will withstand the criticism of the Members of this House. I now want to use my time in speaking of my own service here.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert therein certain documents and excerpts that I wish to refer to in my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am serving here nearly 2,000 miles away from my constituents. They cannot be here to watch us work. They have no first-hand knowledge of what we do, or do not, accomplish for them. Since we convened this session, early last January, I have been on a continual grind, working about 16 hours per day. I receive and answer daily 20 times as much mail as Members here formerly received from their districts. I daily fill numerous appointments with departments. I have been very busy helping to hold important hearings on some very important supply bills involving hundreds of millions of dollars. During every session of this House I am active here on this floor, carefully watching all legislation.

#### PEOPLE DEPENDENT ON PRESS

Our constituents know about what we do here only from what they see in the newspapers. The very few who receive the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can gain from it only a faint idea of the nature and scope of our duties in Congress. The United States Government is the biggest and most ponderous business institution in the world. It has agencies and interests in every foreign country. To serve well here it is necessary for a Member to have intimate knowledge of the nature, scope, and necessities of every department, bureau, commission, independent office, and agency, both domestic and foreign, and to gain this knowledge requires intense study, investigation, and practical experience, for many years. And most of this knowledge can be acquired only when Congress is not in session. The only news about Congress that the people back home get is whatever the press boys in the gallery see fit to send out from Washington over the wires.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the people back home in the gentleman's home in Texas knew how hard he was working, not only on the floor of the House during the sessions of the day, but at night, it must give those citizens great satisfaction to know that fact, and those people back home will never believe the Hearst newspapers but will take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as their guide. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. Coming from that side of the aisle, I especially appreciate it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that he send a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last week to his constituents and let them see that the gentleman from Texas led the fight that saved the Government \$12,000,000 on the Minnesota fire bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I thank my good friend from Missouri for his suggestion. When what we do here is misrepresented at home by designing politicians who are seeking the positions we hold, we have the right to present our side, and let our constituents have all the facts so they may pass on the issues intelligently.

#### SENSATIONAL DEEMED OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE

The press boys in the gallery always report the snarls, and jabs, and fights, and spirited repartee over inconsequential incidents, because they believe their readers demand the sen-

sational, but the earnest important efforts exerted on this floor to pass beneficial legislation, or to stop and kill improper bills, are rarely ever mentioned.

For instance, last week, when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Foulkes], who had been given only 2 minutes to speak since he became a Member of Congress, requested permission to speak 5 minutes, his request was denied, and in defense of his rights I insisted that, although he was a new Member, he was entitled to 5 minutes, and I prevented the older Members there from passing their private bills, and forced the House to adjourn, in order to force the time to be promised him the next day. This proceeding, in no way important to the people, was sent out in full over the wires, and it was given an unwarranted lot of space in the newspapers. But when on April 4, 1934, I led the fight against the Minnesota fire bill, which in every session since 1924 I have killed, and which was mentioned a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cochrane], a bill that would have paid \$10,000,000 to private claimants on a fire occurring in 1918, for which—though it was not legally responsible—the Government then settled with them in full and paid them \$13,000,000 in cash, and they executed releases to the Government acknowledging that they accepted the \$13,000,000 in full settlement of all claims they had against the United States, and now, years after, they tried to dig the Government for another \$10,000,000, and to defeat this bill on the final vote, April 5, 1934, it was necessary for me to employ outsiders at my own expense and to work my office force most of the preceding night mailing a letter to all of the 434 Congressmen, advising them of the nature of the bill, and that the final vote on it would come the first thing Thursday, not one word about killing this expensive bill was sent out to my district, as the saving of this \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 was deemed unimportant by the press gallery, as it was not sensational news. Yet by killing this one bill I saved enough money to pay my salary and the salaries of my office employees for 769 years.

And last week, Mr. Chairman, by objecting to bad bills and preventing them from being passed I saved \$30,859.28 by stopping H.R. 2558; and saved \$18,704.89 by stopping H.R. 2764, and saved millions of dollars by thus stopping the bad precedent its passage would have set, that would have caused thousands of new claims to be filed against the Government; and saved \$11,172.15 by stopping H.R. 3236, and by so doing prevented another bad precedent from being established that would have cost our Government millions of dollars; and saved \$5,000 by amending and reducing H.R. 5405, and saved \$20,000 by stopping H.R. 5588, and saved \$62,340.65 by stopping H.R. 4067. By objections yesterday I stopped a \$3,250 junket to Rome, Italy, another bill that would cost \$40,000 annually for all time to come, and a \$90,000 junket to Turkey. Yet not one word about all of the hard work I had done in preparing to stop these bad bills and the saving of these various sums of money for the taxpayers of this Nation was sent to the Texas papers by the press boys in the gallery, as they did not consider same sensational.

#### SPECIAL PRESS PETS

Members who will wear the press yoke, who will take orders from the press, and who will obey the big press mandates, have every little insignificant act of theirs sent out with headlines and played up on the front page; but Members here who think for themselves, who act for themselves, who refuse to take orders from the big press, and who refuse to kowtow to the reporters in the press gallery, never have anything they do mentioned except in a garbled and derogatory way. Our friendly home papers in our district that would like to mention our work are dependent absolutely on what the news agencies are willing to send them. When the press boys do not want to send them anything, they do not get it. And when you remember that the usually reliable Associated Press has 62 reporters accredited to it in the press gallery, all with different personalities and viewpoints, who take turns in reporting the proceedings, you can then realize that the news sent out, to a more or less extent, is dependent upon the personality, bias, prejudice, and view-

slant of the particular reporter who happens to be on duty at the time.

#### CHEAP SKATES AND PIMPS

In addition to the reputable press and news agencies and reporters, there is always to be found around Congress and State legislatures some so-called "publicity agents", who for pay will write anything one wants written. For pay they will agree to write and get published in the papers flowery articles about Members or attacks upon their opponents. Many of them have offered me their services. I will not even allow them to come in my office. Since I have been in public life I have never yet paid one dollar to any publicity agent to write anything about me, and I never will. I have made many of them mad by refusing to talk to them.

#### HIGH-CLASS JOURNALISTS

There are many newspaper men of high character who cannot be bought. You have not enough money to buy praise from men like Frederic William Wile, or Arthur Brisbane, or David Lawrence, or William P. Kennedy, or Hugh Nugent Fitzgerald, or Max Bentley. You could not bribe them to malign your enemies. Their code of ethics prints the news regardless, and gives praise where praise is due and censures when censure is deserved.

#### SKUNKS LIKE RAYMOND BROOKS

Raymond Brooks is a dirty little rat at Austin, who for several years has been pimping around the Texas Legislature. When dirty work is to be done, he does it. He will write any kind of an article he is paid to write. He is a detestable little cheap skate. For \$1.97 he would sing the praise of the most undeserving. For \$1.99 Raymond Brooks would malign the President. He is a despicable publicity pimp.

#### AMBUSHING ME FROM ABILENE

In a hired attempt to injure me, Raymond Brooks went to Abilene on March 21, 1934. He visited the Reporter-News office. He did not get their viewpoint, because they were my loyal friends. He did not mention me. He did not inquire about my chances for reelection. His only inquiry was about the race in Texas for Governor. Yet from my home city, where my good friends abound, he sent out a malicious article dated "Abilene, March 21, 1934", which he published in the Austin American, bemoaning me and eulogizing my opponents, and predicting my defeat, falsely asserting that Abilene people "were keenly enlivened over the prospect of sweeping TOM BLANTON out of Congress this year." He failed, however, to disguise his source of information. Under the headline "Wagstaff Quitting" he said: "Carl Hammond (meaning Hamlin), district judge and World War veteran, and Representative Oscar F. Chastain are already pouring it on BLANTON", and then he said "R. M. Wagstaff has decided he has had enough of the legislature, and will retire."

#### MACHINE GUNNING ME FROM CISCO

And from Cisco that same day, dated "Cisco, March 21, 1934", Raymond Brooks published in the Austin American an additional attack upon me, again eulogizing my opponents, and predicting my defeat. After glowingly asserting "how very popular Oscar Chastain was in that county" (Eastland) he said that Chastain "is strong in BLANTON's home city." He showed that he did not even know Hamlin, for again he called him "Hammond." He said: "Judge Carl Hammond (meaning Hamlin) has a challenging political background, and a record of success in all his races, is a son of a former Missouri Congressman, is a World War veteran, and is extremely popular with veterans and with organized labor." His last two words let the cat out of the bag. They show who probably were among those who employed him and sent him to Abilene and Cisco.

#### ORGANIZED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

It will be remembered that there are 600,000 strongly organized Government employees, many of whom are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, who last fall, 3 months before Congress convened, tried to get me to pledge my vote to restore the cuts we had made in all salaries.



When I refused they threatened that they would defeat me. I led the fight here against restoring full salaries. The law making cuts expires July 1. President Roosevelt agreed that he would restore part of the cuts. But unless Congress passed a law before July 1, continuing that part of the cuts the President refused to restore, all cuts would expire on July 1, and all salaries would then be fully restored. These organized employees hoped that no law would be passed before July 1. They rejoiced when President Roosevelt, because of veterans' provisions, vetoed the bill continuing part cuts, but I helped to pass this bill over the President's veto, which prevents such cuts from expiring July 1; and these organized Government employees are still fighting me because I helped to prevent the old salaries from being restored in full. I imagine their influence had something to do with sending Raymond Brooks to Abilene and Cisco.

#### RETIRED OFFICERS' LOBBY

I helped to cause over 4,800 emergency officers who wrongfully had gotten themselves retired on big pay, ranging from \$150 to \$500 per month for life, to be dropped from the rolls and their retired pay taken from them, because numerous boards held they were not in any way disabled from service. They were trying to get back on the rolls and to have their pay restored. They had a strong influential lobby here working for them. There were well-to-do doctors and well-to-do lawyers and judges and other officials represented by this lobby. I opposed them at every turn. One important official, who had drawn \$240 per month retired pay until we cut him off, runs an influential newspaper here with circulation all over the United States. They succeeded in getting a Senate amendment passed placing them back on the rolls. I helped to kill this amendment, and we kept them off.

During much of the time for the last 13 years he has been district judge Carl O. Hamlin drew \$5,000 salary from the State, and during part of said time he also drew \$150 per month retired pay from the Government, presumed to be based upon service-connected disabilities, when he was never out of the United States during the war. He was dropped, and several boards have held that he has no service disability, yet he has been trying to get back on the rolls. So I imagine that this retired officers' lobby also may have been helpful in causing Raymond Brooks to go to Abilene and Cisco to specially eulogize Carl Hamlin, whose name Brooks did not even know, as he called him "Hammond."

In his attack sent from Cisco, Brooks falsely asserted that my constituents had defeated me and kept me out of Congress for a while when he knew that I was out because I ran for the Senate; and against a field of 6 prominent candidates, I carried 79 counties in Texas and my district gave me a tremendous majority over all candidates.

Raymond Brooks caused his Cisco article, dated from "Cisco, March 21", but with "Hammond" changed to "Hamlin", to be published in the Wichita Falls newspaper in its issue of March 23, 1934, because it circulates in a part of my district. But the editor, on the following Sunday, March 25, 1934, in the Wichita Falls Daily Times, threw Raymond Brooks' attack in the wastebasket by publishing the following editorial:

#### BLANTON

A political writer thinks that Congressman BLANTON, of the Abilene district, is in danger of defeat this year. In that respect, things are running true to form. Always in March and April and May and June of election years, BLANTON is headed straight for the discard. The trouble is, from the viewpoint of those who would like to see him beaten, that July never supports the hopes that have bloomed in the spring, tra-la-la. Always we are told in March that BLANTON's sun is setting; always the end of July finds it shining brightly as ever.

The people who would like to see BLANTON defeated, and there are quite a few outside of Texas, don't vote in BLANTON's district. The voters in that part of west Texas keep sending him back, usually by thumping majorities. We have a hunch the primary vote will tell the same old story. His courage cannot be questioned.

#### SWEETWATER REPORTER FERTILE FIELD

The Sweetwater Daily Reporter and one small weekly are the only two newspapers published in my district that are fighting against me. Everything they say about me is unkind, garbled, and malicious. The other newspapers are

fair and just. They never stab me under the belt. Unless urged to do so by my friends, the Sweetwater Reporter never mentions me kindly. Raymond Brooks had no trouble in getting the Sweetwater Reporter to broadcast his political propaganda. In its issue of March 23, 1934, dated from "Cisco, March 21" but with "Hammond" changed to "Hamlin", it spread Brooks' attack all over the bottom of its front page. It did not care whether it was true or not. It did not care whether it was just or unjust. It did not care what Brooks' motive was in writing it. The controlling point was that it maligned me, hence the Sweetwater Reporter rejoiced in carrying it. Then in its Sunday issue, April 1, 1934, it attacked me editorially, falsely stating that I draw "20 cents mileage" when for several years mileage has been cut 25 percent, following a determined fight I have made for years to cut it; and it also falsely stated that I favored restoring pay cuts in Federal salaries, when just the opposite was true, and my vote helped to continue on that part of the pay cuts advocated by President Roosevelt. Then in its issue of April 5, 1934, the Sweetwater Reporter carried a ridiculous—United Press—article asserting that I had denounced labor, without quoting anything I had said. My speech was an endeavor to stop the American Federation of Labor from forcing 250,000 heads of families in the auto industry from striking, such employees being well paid and satisfied, and who did not want to strike. At least 90 percent of the people of Sweetwater will approve all I said in this speech. For last year the Sweetwater Reporter paid the Government only \$130.32 for carrying its paper through the mails for a whole year. That is its subsidy. Just to let the Sweetwater people know how very unreliable the United Press and the Sweetwater Reporter are, I am going to have this speech I made on March 20, 1934, against strikes published at my own expense and will later mail them a copy. My constituents have the right to know just what I did say, and not be misled by a garbled account of it in the Sweetwater Reporter, which is nettled because the law grants me the privilege of letting my constituents know what goes on here.

#### WHAT SOME SWEETWATER PEOPLE SAY ABOUT IT

I have received a letter from a substantial citizen of Sweetwater, who says:

DEAR BLANTON: After all you have done for Sweetwater, I am ashamed of the way Cope treats you in his Reporter. You fulfilled the promise you made to me, Vard, Howard, and your other close friends here and gave Sweetwater the first public building you secured for our district, and you may rest assured that it is appreciated by all the people in Sweetwater who know about it.

Cope came here from San Angelo, and he evidently runs the Reporter on orders from San Angelo. His prejudices don't help Sweetwater. I am in favor of the business men here withdrawing all advertising and support from his paper if he continues to register his spleen against you. Don't let his attitude interfere with giving us the C.C.C. camp you promised me you would locate here this summer.

#### TRICKERY OF REDATING AND SHIFTING

Then, in an attempt to try to fool the Cisco people, Raymond Brooks redated this same article he had sent out to papers at Austin, Wichita Falls, and Sweetwater, as if emanating from Cisco, dated "Cisco, March 21", to "March 26", and then, newly dated "Austin, March 26", he caused same to be published in the afternoon edition of the Cisco Daily News of March 26, 1934, as if it were a fresh telegraphic dispatch just sent to Cisco from Austin on March 26, when, to fool readers of the other papers, all of this dirty work had been sent out by Raymond Brooks from Cisco on March 21. He had tried to make the readers of the other papers believe that he was in Cisco on March 21 and had checked up the political situation there, and that he had written his article there, and that it was coming from Cisco on March 21 to them over the wires, when he had not been near Manager LaRoche or Editor Butler, of the Cisco Daily News, on March 21. And after he thought this specially prepared political propaganda he had been hired to disseminate had done all the harm it could do me in the other places, he then sent this same unreliable, irresponsible, lying propaganda right back to Cisco, dated from Austin, March 26. The people of Cisco are highly intelligent and will not be so dumb as to fall for it. Of course,



he corrected his error in name and changed "Hammond" to "Hamlin" when he published the above in the Cisco News.

#### JUGGLING MULTIPLIED

Then, on March 29, 1934, Raymond Brooks again changed dates and places respecting this same article and shifted its date line back to Cisco, and, dating it "Cisco, March 29", he or someone for him or Carl Hamlin, got the Breckenridge American, published where Carl Hamlin lives, in its issue of Sunday, April 1, 1934, to spread same all over the bottom of its front page, covering the exact position it had covered in the Sweetwater Reporter. Of course, the error in name had been changed from "Hammond" to "Hamlin." And thus they hoped to fool the good people of Breckenridge into believing that this was a bona fide news item sent out from Cisco on March 29, when the same article had appeared in the Austin American, Wichita Falls Record-News, and Sweetwater Reporter, dated from "Cisco, March 21", and had later appeared in the Cisco Daily News, dated from "Austin, March 26." When they find that out people will quit reading anything they see from Raymond Brooks. He is absolutely unreliable and irresponsible.

#### NOW PUBLISHING WITHOUT DATING

In last week's Rising Star Record, leaving off the date, but just heading it "By Raymond Brooks, Cisco", this same Raymond Brooks' political propaganda that he originally hatched out on March 21, was carried in full, again appearing on the front page, it being another deliberate attempt to get the good people of Rising Star to believe that this hired opposition and bogus political check-up came from Cisco. I would not be worthy of the confidence of my constituents, or qualified to hold their office, if I permitted this hired juggling to continue unnoticed.

#### WHAT AN AUSTIN CITIZEN THOUGHT OF IT

The following letter, dated at Austin on March 24, 1934, I received from a substantial citizen of Austin, indicates just how very ridiculous this Raymond Brooks' political propaganda appears to anyone who is posted:

DEAR JUDGE: I am sending you some articles clipped from the Austin American written by Raymond Brooks, one he sent from Abilene, and one from Cisco, both dated March 21. Undoubtedly this is inspired propaganda against you. If his life depended on it, Raymond Brooks could not tell how any one of the numerous precincts in Austin or Travis County, where he lives, will go in the coming primary regarding any candidate or any race. Surely he won't succeed in fooling many people in your counties.

His reference to Oscar Chastain amused me greatly. Oscar was a joke here and in the legislature didn't know what it was all about, and he certainly wouldn't know what it was all about in Washington. After the redistricting, Oscar bragged here about his framing you, and said that Wagstaff from your Abilene district didn't like you because you had beaten Wagstaff's father for Congress, and that Wagstaff had helped him take 10 of your best counties away from you, and had added 3 new counties in which Oscar was well acquainted, and that he thus had his election and your defeat assured. I don't believe that any Texas voters will approve of politicians framing up and gerrymandering a district in trying to beat somebody and to elect themselves. I advise you to check up on Oscar's doublecrossing the independent oil producers.

#### HOME PEOPLE KNOW BEST

If Raymond Brooks had asked the newspaper men in Abilene, instead of someone I had defeated for office, about my standing, he would have obtained more reliable information. The following is an editorial from the Abilene Daily Reporter-News, carried in its issue of January 22, 1934:

#### NOBODY WILL BEAT BLANTON

Another open season is rolling around for those who would like to retire TOM BLANTON to private law practice, either in person or by proxy, with indications of a rather large field against the Seventeenth District Congressman.

Vain hope. There never was a less propitious time for inaugurating a really formidable "beat BLANTON" campaign, and the more candidates there are the lesser chance any will have. Even this early in the game it looks safe to count him in again.

BLANTON's forthright personality and his sometime headlong way of doing things have made him vulnerable politically in the respect that important enemies have been needlessly created. That has given him a lot of grief and cost him a lot of money in defending himself against attacks, most of them springing from personal motive. He has won in the past, and will win in the future, on a record of public service that is impregnable. Opponents who start out with promise of heavy artillery invariably end the campaign in a feeble and futile popping of firecrackers.

There was a time when BLANTON was virtually a lone wolf in the halls of the House of Representatives, defiantly baring his teeth at the pack. Jealous of their own petty prerogatives, stirred to childish anger by his ruthless baring of a system to which they subscribed, a great many otherwise fine Congressmen stooped to a conspiracy to make him impotent.

They failed. That time has passed. The west Texan is ace high in the national council, fitting like a glove in the recovery program. He is happy, busy, and so usefully engaged in the people's business that they will, when the time comes, send him back with plenty of votes to spare. Nobody will beat BLANTON this year.

#### OFFICE BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

The office I hold is not mine. It belongs to the people whom I have the honor to represent. Whenever they want me to relinquish it I will do it without a murmur. Whenever my constituents believe that another can and will give them better service here than I am giving, I want them to retire me. It is their confidence and esteem only that remunerates me for all the hard work I have done, and am still doing, in their behalf. I have gained nothing from the office financially. Above a bare frugal living for my family, I have spent each year since I have been in Washington my entire income in trying to make the United States a more decent place for a poor man to live, and in addition I have sold my home in Abilene, my small ranch and livestock at Albany, and two farms since entering public office, and spent it all in carrying on investigations of graft, waste, and extravagance that has existed in Government business. I have never spent \$1 of any public money on any junket. I have traveled all over the United States during vacations checking up Government plants, but have always spent every dollar of the expense out of my own pocket. If I were to die today, I would not leave anything whatever received from the Government that has been left over from my salary after paying expenses. So the people realize that they have an investment in me. Since they have been paying me a salary I have learned all about their business, with intimate detailed knowledge of every office and bureau, both in the United States and abroad, and just what their necessities are and all about the many ways they have of trying to get more money allowed them for waste and extravagance, and I know just how to stop them from getting it. It would take any new man, no matter how able and industrious and well qualified he might be, at least 10 years of hard work and intensive study and investigation to gain the knowledge I now have about Government business. Is there any big business concern with a hundred stores scattered all over the world that would discharge its general manager who had been with it for years, and who knew every detail about all of its business, just to employ some new man who wanted the job when it would take years for the new man to learn anything about the business? That is the situation that appeals to my constituents. I am their general manager here in the House of Representatives. Since they have been paying me a salary I have learned all about their complicated business. I am prepared to earn their salary every day that I serve here. I do not have to spend years to learn how. The people in my district realize that during the years it would take a new man to learn how, they might be losing hundreds of millions of dollars and their business might go to the bowwows.

#### CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONLY BULWARK

The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the Congressman's only bulwark against misrepresentations. Realizing this, and that unless Members here had some way of getting the real facts about their service here before their constituents, any vicious interest they opposed, or any malicious newspaper they refused to obey, or any designing politician in their district seeking to supplant them, through base misrepresentations about them made in their districts, while Members were busily engaged in Washington, could ruin any Member here, this Congress many years ago provided by law that any Member of Congress, by paying the full cost of printing himself, could send excerpts from the RECORD, covering the proceedings of this House, to the people in his district. Congress felt that this was a protection to the people, as well as a protection to their Congressmen. That has been a wise law since 1873. In one day here, fre-



quently I save enough to pay the entire cost of printing the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the expense of sending through the mails all franked matter sent by all 435 Congressmen for a whole year.

#### OPPONENTS ACTIVE IN MY DISTRICT

Since early in January, while I have been busy here 16 hours per day, Mr. State Legislator Oscar F. Chastain, who brags that he specially framed and gerrymandered my district to defeat me and elect himself, and Mr. District Judge Carl O. Hamlin, whom I stopped from drawing retired pay of \$150 per month, have been traveling all over my district misrepresenting me and my record, when they know that I am 2,000 miles away, busily attending to the people's business, and daily helping the President in his recovery program, and that I will not get to leave here, or to devote one minute to a campaign, until just a short time before the primary.

They are telling my constituents that I am unpopular in Congress. I challenge them to name one Member of this House or the Senate who is unfriendly to me. I differ here on the floor frequently with many Members about legislation, and we cross swords with one another and fight back and forth across the aisle, and every Member here will admit that I have helped to kill as many bills in this House as any other Member for the past 16 years, but all of my colleagues here now realize that I am earnest and sincere in every fight I make, and I feel gratified that I now enjoy the respect and friendly feeling of every Member of this House and every Senator at the other end of the Capitol. I believe that I have as many close, personal, dependable friends in this House and in the Senate as any other Member here. I am the recipient daily of kindness, helpful cooperation, and friendly assistance from different Members, and their friendship is worth more to me than anything else in the world. Of course Oscar F. Chastain and Carl O. Hamlin do not want me to send excerpts from the RECORD about my work here to my constituents. It interferes with their misrepresentations. It dispels the cobwebs which malicious articles such as the one that dirty, cowardly, little cur, Raymond Brooks, sent out to newspapers in their behalf on March 21 from Cisco and my home city of Abilene. These excerpts showing my speech against unwarranted strikes, interferes with the misrepresentation made by the United Press and the Sweetwater Reporter when they said I "denounced labor" without quoting a single word I had said.

#### COULD NOT EVEN ANNOUNCE DECENTLY

When announcing, Carl O. Hamlin could not even do it decently. When he printed his announcement in the Breckenridge American on January 11, 1934, he tried to hit me under the belt by stating that up to this time the three new counties of Fisher, Erath, and Hamilton have been "ably represented in Congress" by the three Members—from whose districts Oscar F. Chastain brags that he took these three counties in order to defeat me and elect himself—and that he would give these new counties that same able representation they now have, purposely and designedly insinuating thereby that if these counties elected me they would not have that high class of representation.

#### BECAME ASHAMED OF THE LILA KEITH STATEMENT

Because I made public the statement he had filed here in 1928, when he had compensation granted him, purporting to have been signed by one named "Lila Keith", in which she certified that following his discharge Carl O. Hamlin was nervous, that his lungs gave him trouble, and that he had boils on his head, he has just printed a vicious attack against me in both the Breckenridge American and the Stephens County Sun, asserting that there is no such statement signed Lila Keith in his file, and that he has never been nervous, and has never suffered with his lungs, and has never had boils on his head. If there is now no such statement by Lila Keith in his file, he has caused someone to remove it. It was in his file just before he had the Veterans' Administration here to send his folder containing his file to the branch office at Dallas for his personal inspection. I will prove that it was in his file. Carl Hamlin cannot deny that

he had friends here among the retired officers in the employ of the Veterans' Bureau, who themselves had been dropped, and who had access to his file. Carl Hamlin cannot deny that he had friends here, not employed by the Bureau, who have been helping him with his appeal, who have had access to his file. Carl Hamlin cannot deny that there was a statement by Lila Keith once in his folder. Carl Hamlin cannot deny that someone took a statement by Lila Keith out of his file. Carl Hamlin cannot deny that the official records of the Bureau still show now that there was once in his file a statement by Lila Keith, and he cannot deny that he knew this on April 5, 1934, at the time he printed a denial of it in the Breckenridge American. And Carl Hamlin cannot deny that when he printed that false denial in the Breckenridge Daily American on Thursday, April 5, 1934, and when he printed it in the Stephens County Sun on the same date, he then knew that he was deliberately trying to deceive the good people of Breckenridge, and of Stephens County, and of my district, in trying to make them believe that he knew nothing about a statement made by Lila Keith, and that there had never been a statement by Lila Keith in his file, and that I had concocted a false statement about Lila Keith manufactured out of the whole cloth with no basis or foundation whatever for it, when, if he had wanted to be honest and truthful, and had not wanted to deceive them, he would have told the people that there was a statement by Lila Keith once in his file, regardless of the claims he might now be making concerning it. Common decency and common honesty demanded that he should have made that revelation to the people in the statement he published in said two newspapers on April 5, 1934.

#### FIGHT AGAINST RETIRED PAY RACKETEERS BEGAN IN 1931 LONG BEFORE CARL HAMLIN ANNOUNCED FOR CONGRESS

District Judge Carl O. Hamlin would now have the people believe that I am waging my fight against allowing 4,800 officers who are not disabled through service to draw big retired pay of from \$125 to \$500 per month from the Government for life, because he is a candidate for Congress. He knows that is untrue. These 4,800 officers had gotten themselves on the rolls through misrepresentation and fraud. Congress had passed no law authorizing them to draw pay. The law passed by Congress authorized only the officers who had been disabled, and whose disability resulted from their service during the World War to draw pay. It did not take in the pretenders. It did not take in those who had simply presumed themselves to have been injured in service. These 4,800 officers had gotten themselves on the roll, and had pay allowed themselves, through misrepresentation, fraud, and collusion. The boards that did the retiring were composed of lawyers and doctors who had retired themselves, and who had granted themselves retired pay. They simply scratched each other's backs, and after retiring themselves on big monthly pay for life, additional to their big government salaries, they then began to retire their friends holding big State jobs all over the country.

#### MY HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 802

After going to quite a lot of expense out of my own pocket checking up thousands of such cases, and after spending several months of hard work in vacation on investigations, the House of Representatives by unanimous consent on March 3, 1931, granted me permission to have printed as a House document my complete authentic list of all emergency officers with retired pay, giving their name, rank, address, class number, length of service, amount of retirement pay, accrued amount, and amount of their first check, and the position, if any, they held with the Veterans' Administration, and the annual salary they were drawing from the Government, if any, additional to their monthly retired pay. This became House document no. 802 and embraced 157 printed pages. It showed on page 139 that this district judge, Carl O. Hamlin (who was then drawing a State salary of \$5,000 per year from Texas), whose address was given as "Box 41, 1303 W. Walker Street, Breckenridge", had gotten one of these "scratch-each-other's-back" boards to grant him retired pay of \$150 per month for life, which \$150 he was drawing each month from the Government addi-

tional to the \$5,000 salary he was drawing from the State of Texas as district judge. He was not a candidate for Congress then on March 3, 1931. Yet I was fighting then to take him off the pay roll of the Government, just as I was then fighting to take the other 4,800 brother officers of his off of the Government pay roll, because there was no law authorizing it.

And in this House Document No. 802 you will find on its front page this certificate:

Seventy-first Congress, third session

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, March 3, 1931.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, by unanimous consent,  
Ordered, That there be printed as a House document a list of the emergency retired officers, together with their pay and position.  
Attest:

WM. TYLER PAGE, Clerk.

MY HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 355

Then after going to a lot of additional expense out of my own pocket getting the data from all over the United States, and after putting in more than a year's hard work on it, done mostly in vacations, I introduced in the House of Representatives my House Joint Resolution No. 355 on April 6, 1932, which was immediately referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It contained 35 printed pages, and named several hundred lawyers and doctors employed in the Veterans' Bureau, who were drawing big salaries ranging up to \$9,000 per annum from the Government, and who at the same time, by claiming that they were disabled from service connection, and by "scratching each other's backs", each aiding the other, had granted to themselves retired pay of from \$125 to \$500 per month for life, additional to their regular Government salaries ranging up to \$9,000 per annum, and I showed that it was a fraud upon the Government; and following the hearing and the evidence I produced before the Committee on Military Affairs, over 4,800 of these pretenders, who preferred to be called "the presumers", because they presumed that they had been disabled through service, were dropped from the rolls and kept off of the pay roll of the Government, and District Judge Carl O. Hamlin was one of them so dropped, and they have not yet been able to get back.

MY SPEECH OF MARCH 2, 1934

These 4,800 retired officers who have been dropped from the rolls and had their pay cut off have had one of the strongest, most active, most influential, and most powerful lobbies in Washington working for months to get a law passed through Congress granting them pay, despite the fact that they have no disability of service connection. They got the Senate to pass an amendment restoring their pay. The matter was up at issue between the House and the Senate. At the time I made my speech in the House on March 2, 1934, I was then fighting to keep the House from accepting the Senate amendment. I had this speech carefully prepared, with each and every statement made in it carefully checked to see that there was no error in it, and, with the exception of certain quoted evidence in it, delivered it in the House; but, so as to give me an opportunity to carefully recheck it before printing it, I printed only a small part of it on March 2, 1934, and secured permission of the House to have the balance of it printed later in the RECORD, and then I carefully checked up every fact stated in such speech, and saw to it that there was not an error in it when it was printed in the RECORD. And there is not an error in it. There is no erroneous statement in it about Carl O. Hamlin. And this speech helped to defeat the Senate amendment which would have put said 4,800 officers back on the roll and paid Carl O. Hamlin \$150 per month for life. He cannot escape from the facts set forth by me simply by entering the lawyer's "general denial." If he wants to deny, he must deny specifically. I had my March 2, 1934, speech printed on March 12, 1934, and copies of it went to several citizens in Breckenridge on March 15, 1934, and were read by Carl O. Hamlin soon thereafter; a copy of the daily RECORD carrying such speech reached the office of the Breckenridge American as early as March 16, 1934, and yet Carl O. Hamlin did not make any denial of any part of it until April 5, 1934, when he on that date

attempted to enter a general denial in the Breckenridge newspapers. He has never yet advised me that I made any statement about him that is erroneous. And there is no statement in my said speech of March 2, 1934, about him that is erroneous. Each and every statement in it about him is true and correct, and I can prove it by the records. I challenge him to show any statement in such speech about him that is incorrect.

CARL O. HAMLIN DELIBERATELY MISREPRESENTED HIS OWN RECORD

Keep in mind that in his statement he published in the Breckenridge American and the Stephens County Sun on April 5, 1934, and in the Hamlin Herald and Stamford Leader last Friday, and which he will doubtless publish in the other papers, and which by circular letters he is now mailing out to the voters of my district, while I am busy here 2,000 miles away, Carl O. Hamlin stated emphatically that he had never heard of a person by the name of Lila Keith, that his nerves were always steady, that his lungs were sound, and that he had never had a boil on his head during his entire life, and that I had deliberately falsified his record by stating in my speech anything about a statement by Lila Keith in his file, and that "Mr. BLANTON ought to furnish the Veterans' Bureau with a copy of this affidavit, for they are unable to find such in my file." Carl O. Hamlin knew when he published the above that he was deliberately misrepresenting me, was misrepresenting the facts, and was concealing from the public things about Lila Keith that he himself should have made clear. Read the following:

AFFIDAVIT

The District of Columbia:

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Mrs. Louise Kennedy Marx, known to me to be a credible citizen residing at No. 4000 Cathedral Avenue, Northwest, in Washington, D.C., who, being by me duly sworn, upon her oath deposes and says: My name is Louise Kennedy Marx; I saw the folder containing the file of Carl Oswald Hamlin, No. C-1433,354, containing all of his papers filed with the United States Veterans' Administration relating to his claim for compensation and retired pay, at the time an official of said Veterans' Administration exhibited it to Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON in my presence to ascertain why the boards had held that Hamlin had no disability connected with his service, and I know positively that at that time there was in such folder a statement signed by Lila Keith on November 17, 1928, certifying that Carl O. Hamlin was nervous after his discharge, that his lungs gave him trouble, and that he had boils on his head; that in my presence Congressman BLANTON had the above allegations copied from said statement of Lila Keith, and also had copied other data from other papers said Carl O. Hamlin had filed with said Veterans' Administration; if said statement of Lila Keith is not now in the folder containing the file of Carl O. Hamlin, it has been removed therefrom within the last two months, because I know positively that it was in said Carl O. Hamlin's folder just before it was sent to Texas; the said statement of Lila Keith was right next to a statement made by Dr. Wilbur Smith relative to his removing the appendix of said Carl O. Hamlin in August 1919.

Mrs. LOUISE KENNEDY MARX.

Sworn to and subscribed by the said Mrs. Louise Kennedy Marx before me on this the 12th day of April A.D. 1934. Given under my hand and seal of office in the city of Washington, District of Columbia.

[SEAL]

HARRY PILLEN,

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

WHY DID CARL O. HAMLIN WANT HIS FILE IN TEXAS?

Long before I made my speech on March 2, 1934, Carl O. Hamlin had written and filed in the Bureau here the following letter:

NINETIETH DISTRICT COURT,

C. O. HAMLIN, JUDGE,

Breckenridge, Tex., January 29, 1934.

Replying to MCC-Bf

Re: Carl O. Hamlin C-I, 433,354.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN,

Director of Compensation,

Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hereby make the request to have my case file decentralized and sent to the regional office at Dallas, Tex., so that I may have the privilege of examining said file.

Respectfully,

CARL O. HAMLIN.

What did he want with his file? He said in his printed statement that he is not making any further effort to be restored to the pay roll. If he were not still trying to get another appeal of his case, why did he want his voluminous file sent to Dallas for his personal inspection?



But the Bureau here did not grant his request. Then he had one of his brother officers here intercede for him and insist on his file being sent to Dallas. Such officer here had access to his file at any time. So one folder containing part of his voluminous file was sent to Dallas on March 17, 1934. Shortly after it reached Dallas Carl O. Hamlin went there from Breckenridge and inspected it. He got the adjudication officer to write him a letter dated March 26, 1934, showing what said file contained and that there was no statement by Lila Keith in same. Of course, it was not then in that folder, because it had been taken out of it, and was probably taken out in Washington before it was sent to Texas. Then, finding out that they had overlooked in said folder a work sheet that specified that there was an affidavit by Lila Keith that had formed part of the evidence in Carl O. Hamlin's case, which specified that following his discharge he was nervous, that his lungs gave him trouble, and that he had boils on his head, he caused the following letters to be written:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,  
April 3, 1934.

Memorandum—MCC-Ba.  
From: Director Veterans' Claims Service.  
To: Chief Clerk's Division.  
Subject: Hamlin, Carl O. C-1,433,354.  
Attention: Decentralization Section.

This veteran's folder was decentralized to the Dallas (Tex.) regional office, March 17, 1934. However, his application for retirement and correspondence between him and the Director of Compensation are on file in the central office folder.

Capt. Watson B. Miller, chairman of the national rehabilitation committee, the American Legion, as representative of the veteran, has requested that this additional evidence be forwarded to the Dallas (Tex.) regional office for the convenience of the veteran in preparing his appeal for restoration of emergency officers' retirement benefits.

GEORGE E. BROWN.

Capt. Watson B. Miller is the same helper who got \$187.50 per month for William Wolff (Poker Bill) Smith. Then the Bureau sent this letter to Dallas:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, April 3, 1934.

Refer to MCC-Ba.  
Hamlin, Carl O. C-1,433,354.

MANAGER,  
Dallas, Tex.:

This veteran's folder was decentralized to your office March 17, 1934. However, certain correspondence and the veteran's retirement application were not included in his folder. This additional evidence is now being transmitted for the convenience of the veteran in preparing his appeal for restoration of emergency officers' retirement benefits.

GEORGE E. BROWN,  
Director Veterans' Claims Service.

So you see, that despite his statement to the contrary, Carl O. Hamlin is now preparing another appeal and is trying to get back on the disabled roll and is trying to get back his \$150 per month, to which several boards have decided he is not entitled under the law, because he has no disability of service connection.

#### HAMLIN CORRECTS HIS EVIDENCE

Before the second folder mentioned above reached Dallas, Carl O. Hamlin had the Dallas officer give him a new letter dated March 30, 1934, which admitted that there had been a statement by Lila Keith filed in his folder, but that it was taken out, claiming that it didn't relate to him.

From a letter which Manager Read Johnson of the Dallas office wrote to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator, I quote the following pertinent excerpts:

In reply to your radiogram of April 10, 1934, concerning the case folder of Carl O. Hamlin, C-1433354, there is attached hereto, in accordance with your instructions, two photostat copies of a work sheet which is contained in this folder and which is the only piece of paper contained in this entire file, having any reference whatever to an affidavit made by one Lila Keith in connection with this claim.

This claims file was received in this office on March 22, 1934, at 8:30 a.m. It was immediately dispatched to the adjudication officer, and it did not leave his desk until after an inspection of it had been made by the claimant. \* \* \* While inspecting the file Judge Hamlin made definite inquiry with reference to an affidavit that might be contained therein which was supposed to

have been made by one Lila Keith. \* \* \* On March 26, 1934, at the request of the claimant, the adjudication officer wrote Judge Hamlin a letter detailing to him the evidence that was contained in his file. A copy of this letter is attached hereto. Some 2 or 3 days later Judge Hamlin came into the office personally to make an inspection of the file and it was again gone over by the adjudication officer, with Judge Hamlin, as referred to above. \* \* \* At the time Judge Hamlin was in the office, he requested that a letter be forwarded to him over the signature of the manager, stating whether or not the piece of evidence in question was in the file. On March 30, 1934, I released a letter to him, advising him that upon another careful search of the file the adjudication officer had discovered a work sheet in the folder making reference to an affidavit made by one Lila Keith.

And this work sheet, made by some Bureau employee, mentioning the different documents filed in evidence by Carl O. Hamlin, in behalf of his claim, forming an index for the convenience of the different boards passing upon his case, is headed "Bureau examinations" and gives a brief outline of various affidavits embracing one by Dr. R. Van Duzen, one by Dr. Grover C. Wood, one by Dr. B. F. Rhodes, one by Dr. Wilbur Smith, and one by Lila Keith, dated November 17, 1928, received at Bureau November 19, 1928—which was the same identical date the affidavits of Doctors Rhodes and Smith were received showing they were all filed at the same time, and even this work sheet showed that in here affidavit Lila Keith stated that claimant has been very nervous ever since his discharge, and that his lungs have given him trouble, and that his head has given him trouble also, and that he has boils on his head continuously.

Carl O. Hamlin tried to convince these Bureau officials at Dallas that Lila Keith was referring to another, and because they could not find the original affidavit of Lila Keith in that folder had them write him the second letter dated March 30, 1934, certifying that "apparently" it had been taken out of the file for that reason. All of the above occurred before Capt. Watson B. Miller had the Bureau send the additional Hamlin folder to Dallas on April 3, 1934. How did Carl O. Hamlin and the Dallas officials know on April 30, 1934, when Hamlin had them write him the second letter, that his additional folder here in Washington did not contain the original Lila Keith affidavit, for it did not leave Washington until April 3, 1934? How does Carl O. Hamlin know that this original Lila Keith affidavit is not in some one of the numerous other files he has here in the Veterans' Bureau? For he has other files here which have not yet been sent to Texas.

CAPT. WATSON B. MILLER

District Judge Carl O. Hamlin selected the right man to help him get his \$150 per month back when he selected Miller, who has received a salary of \$7,500, and part of the time \$10,000, for looking after disabled lawyers and judges. He helped Maj. William Wolff "Poker Bill" Smith get his \$187.50 per month while Smith was drawing a salary from the Government of \$9,000 per annum. I quote from my House Joint Resolution 355, page 12, the following portion of the testimony Capt. Watson B. Miller gave for Smith after he had been turned down by various boards, to wit:

Captain Miller testifying that since 1923 (when Smith became general counsel) he and Smith "have traveled extensively together from one end of the country to another, many times sleeping in the same room in hotels and on trains; scores of times during that period we have played golf together; frequently when playing golf together I have noticed that he held his hand in this position. I have also seen him walk a long distance over the holes with golf club in one hand and his other hand pressed on his lower left side; \* \* \* Major Smith and I are about the same age and weight; on 25 or 30 occasions, when we have been doing similar things, he has had to quit before I did; on one occasion, when we were playing golf, he got as far as the seventh hole of a certain course we were on and quit, and didn't say why he quit, but he had some reason for doing it; it may have been associated with his service-connected disability."

And I quote from my said House Joint Resolution 355, page 10, the following from an affidavit of Annabel Hinderliter (whose evidence before the Military Affairs Committee in my hearing on my said resolution I quoted in my speech of March 2, 1934):

Annabel Hinderliter, stating that since May 7, 1921, Smith had been her immediate superior, that he had suffered with a cough

and "since I have known Major Smith he has always carried more than the usual number of handkerchiefs," and on October 25, 1929, Smith—

The foregoing is the kind of evidence "pet" officers like "Poker Bill" Smith and Carl O. Hamlin, who were never within several thousand miles of a Germany enemy, filed in 1928, when they were trying to draw from the Government \$187.50 and \$150 per month, respectively, for life, to which under the law they were not entitled. When we faced Poker Bill with his record, he threw up his hands and agreed to pay his money back to the Government. Why does not Carl O. Hamlin pay back to the Government the several thousand dollars he has wrongfully received? He is still fighting to get back on the pay roll at \$150 per month for life.

CARL O. HAMLIN GETS CHEAPEST INSURANCE IN THE WORLD

In his long attempted explanation and excuses to Mr. R. M. Simmons, of Sweetwater, which Carl O. Hamlin has published in all the newspapers, he admits that his health is now good (because he knows that voters expect a candidate for Congress to be in good health) he said: "My loss will continue to be financial as well as physical, by reason of the greatly increased insurance premium which I am now compelled to pay.

From one of Carl O. Hamlin's voluminous folders still in the Bureau here in Washington I quote the following letter he wrote:

C. O. HAMLIN,  
JUDGE NINETIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF TEXAS, STEPHENS COUNTY,  
Breckenridge, June 29, 1928.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed herewith find my check in the amount of \$23.60. The same being premium payment for the quarter beginning July 1, 1928, on policy no. K-606646, in the name of Carl O. Hamlin.

Please be kind enough to acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours truly,

C. O. HAMLIN.

COH/h  
Encl. ck.

The above was a \$10,000 policy of Government insurance, which unlike the unstable insurance most of us carry, was good as gold, because payable by the Government, and under its provisions if he became permanently disabled it would be paid to him in cash, without his dying to get it, and it was given him at the special low rate for 5 years which Congress provided for all veterans from April 1, 1927, to April 1, 1932, at the end of which 5 years he had the right to convert it into permanent insurance. Where is there any citizen in my district not a veteran, who for these 5 years had a gilt-edge gold policy for \$10,000 furnished them by the Government for a premium of only \$23.60 per quarter? And at the end of said 5 years, when he converted his insurance into a permanent policy with its rate never changed again, he was granted this \$10,000 policy for only \$64.60 per quarter. No civilians in my district get that cheap a rate for a policy that is good as gold. The above is shown by the following letter Hamlin filed here:

C. O. HAMLIN, JUDGE, NINETIETH JUDICIAL  
DISTRICT OF TEXAS, STEPHENS COUNTY,  
Breckenridge, March 1, 1932.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,  
Insurance Department, Dallas, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: I am herewith enclosing 5-year convertible term policy no. K-606646, in the amount of \$10,000, in the name of Carl Oswald Hamlin, together with application for change to ordinary life policy in the same amount of \$10,000.

You will note in the application herewith enclosed, I have designated the effective date of said change as of April 1. According to my understanding, my present 5-year convertible term policy expires on April 1, and I desire to convert the same into an ordinary life policy, without any lapse in my insurance. The point is, I now desire to exchange my 5-year term policy for an ordinary life policy for the same amount as my term policy, and I most assuredly do not want any lapse in my insurance. So, if for any reason, the effective date which I have designated for the change would cause a lapse in my insurance, I wish you would please notify me at once so that I may change the said date; or this letter will be your authority to so change the said application.

I have designated in the application for change of policy the mode of premium payment as quarterly, and am herewith enclosing my check in the amount of \$64.60, the same being quarterly

premium payment which will be due upon the ordinary life policy.

If I have overlooked any matter or failed to do anything herewith that will endanger or cause the lapsing of my insurance, I will appreciate your notifying me at once, for, as stated before, I do not want my insurance to lapse, but want to take advantage of the privilege within the time limit to exchange my present 5-year convertible term policy to an ordinary life policy.

Thanking you for giving this matter your prompt attention, I am,

Yours very truly,

CARL OSWALD HAMLIN.

Until he became a candidate for Congress he signed his name Carl O. Hamlin and Carl Oswald Hamlin, but now in all campaign literature he is broadcasting throughout my district he signs "Carl Hamlin." He must be thinking about what Lila Keith said, that he was nervous after his discharge, and had boils on his head. What made him nervous? He was never out of the United States.

He thus carries a gilt-edged Government policy of \$10,000 which will be paid to him in cash if he ever becomes disabled, and will be paid to his family when he dies, for which he pays only \$64.60 per quarter. Is not that cheap insurance? And the premium will not ever be raised on him.

CARL O. HAMLIN ALSO RECEIVED A BONUS OF \$1,186

C. O. Hamlin, Judge

Ninetieth Judicial District of Texas, Stephens County

Breckenridge, March 28, 1929.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,  
Insurance Division, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I hold policy no. K-606646 in the sum of \$10,000, issued April 1, 1927, also adjusted-service certificate no. A-2099901 in the sum of \$1,186.

I find no restrictions in these policies as to travel, etc., however, as travel by airplane is now becoming quite ordinary, just as a matter of precaution, I desire to know if you interpret your policy to place any restrictions on such mode of travel. I would appreciate you advising me in regard to this matter.

Yours truly,

C. O. HAMLIN.

DISTRICT GERRYMANDED IN 1917

In 1917 I represented the Sixteenth (Old Jumbo) District of Texas, embracing 59 counties, running west to El Paso. Certain politicians in the Texas Legislature who wanted to go to Congress, gerrymandered the State, took 49 counties on the west away from me, and shunted me into an entirely new district running southeast to within 20 miles of Austin, embracing both Burnet and Llano Counties, placing me in what was then the new Seventeenth District. But their plans did not succeed. The people did not appreciate this "framing up" of districts. I won out over all candidates.

ANOTHER GERRYMANDER IN 1933

The following letter, dated September 3, 1933, sent me by a substantial citizen of Eastland, contains interesting information:

DEAR JUDGE: I enclose you yesterday's paper showing Oscar F. Chastain's announcement against you for Congress. In a talk I had with him he said he had gotten the legislature to strip you of 10 counties that had always given you big majorities, and had left you the counties embracing all of the politicians you had beaten for office. He told us that the representative from Abilene, in the State legislature, wanted to get your goat because you had kept his dad from going to Congress, and that he helped him frame you. He seems elated, and said that he had added the counties of Erath, Hamilton, and Fisher to your district, and that he had all three of them grabbed, as he was a native of Erath, and had influential relatives in Hamilton, and had a strong hold on Fisher. He thinks he is sure to carry Jones as he once taught school in Stamford.

I am telling you this just for information. You needn't worry. We will take care of you in Eastland County. Chastain's hair has grown white holding unimportant offices, and he has never made good at any of them. My private opinion is that he will run best in counties where he is least known.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM EASTLAND

I received the following letter from a friend at Eastland dated March 31, 1934:

DEAR JUDGE BLANTON: I want to give you the low down on Oscar Chastain. He has just employed a newspaper woman named Miss Maifred Hale, who is to run his campaign office and get publicity for him in newspapers. She came here from Fort Worth in 1931.

When Oscar Chastain made his race for the legislature his main plank was that he would abolish a lot of the surplus courts,



and he mentioned when you was district judge for Eastland, and Breckenridge, and Albany, and Baird, and Abilene, and held the courts for these five counties, and now there was 1 judge for Breckenridge, 2 for Eastland, and 2 at Abilene. One of our judges here gave Oscar's daughter a position as stenographer, and Chastain forgot all about his campaign plank. He also promised that he would cut the cost of auto tags. But he failed. He assured the independent oil men that he would get them relief, and then laid down on them. After he got to Austin he said the people don't know what they want. And while C. W. Hoffman was in Austin he heard Chastain say that the people at Eastland don't know the difference between a barrel of oil and a barrel of molasses. As soon as you get home, let me know. We are not going to let you be lied on again like you were last time when Joe ran against you.

#### EDITORIAL FROM EASTLAND CHRONICLE

The following editorial is quoted from the Eastland Chronicle, which is the oldest newspaper in Eastland County, published at Eastland, where Oscar F. Chastain lives, in the issue of last Friday, April 13, 1934:

In a series of articles by Raymond Brooks, Austin newspaper correspondent, published recently in a number of papers in the Seventeenth Congressional District, the statement is made that Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON is facing the supreme struggle of his political career, and that the result of the coming Democratic primaries may be to unhorse him for good.

Opponents of Mr. BLANTON, who are better informed as to the true state of affairs in the Seventeenth Congressional District than Mr. Brooks appears to be, get little comfort from these articles. They only wish these were the facts.

The facts are THOMAS L. BLANTON is stronger today in his district than he was 2 years ago when he defeated Joe H. Jones. It is also a fact that Jones was a stronger opponent than either of the candidates out after BLANTON's political scalp this year.

Brooks points out that both of BLANTON's opponents have records, one as a district judge and the other as a State legislator. That is true, but records oftentimes prove one's undoing, and that is just what many predict will happen to BLANTON's opponents when the records they have made are compared with those of BLANTON.

The Eastland County candidate, Brooks states, is very popular in the county and the district. Brooks doesn't know his west Texans if he thinks any man is popular with them who stands up in the legislature of their State and makes the statement that "they don't know what they want", and that "they do not know the difference between a barrel of oil and a barrel of molasses." The Eastland County representative is charged with having made that statement in a speech in the State legislature. Whether he used such poor judgment or not this writer does not know, but he was credited by newspaper correspondents and others with having said it. We believe he denies it, however.

Col. Hugh Nugent Fitzgerald, veteran political observer on the Austin American, same newspaper on which Brooks is employed, doesn't share Brooks' opinion of BLANTON's chances for reelection. In the July 22 issue of the Austin American Fitzgerald praised BLANTON for the record he has made in Congress and pointed out that many former critics of BLANTON had seen the light and were now thanking him for the splendid, unselfish service he has rendered the laborer, the farmer, war veterans, and others, and ventured the assertion that BLANTON would continue in Congress as long as he desired.

Brooks also showed his lack of knowledge of the existing facts when he stated that "after a long service in the House BLANTON got left out." BLANTON did not get left out, he could have easily been reelected, but dropped out of his own accord.

This is a time when voters are going to think twice before they act to turn out an "in" for an "out", especially when the "in" has been tried and found not wanting and the "out" is more or less an unknown quantity.

#### BROWNWOOD AND BROWN COUNTY STOLEN FROM ME

Brown is one of the 10 counties which Oscar F. Chastain has been bragging to people that he took away from me when he "framed" my district to elect himself. Brownwood is its county seat. The Brownwood Bulletin is its daily newspaper and is one of the best in west Texas. Its editor had distinguished service during the World War. He is Hon. James C. White. The following is his editorial published last week:

#### TOM BLANTON'S RECORD

Some of the most eulogistic appraisals of THOMAS L. BLANTON's service in Congress are made by people outside Texas, reminding one of the Scriptural declaration that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country, although in Mr. BLANTON's case there is an abundance of honor for him in his own district. From The Chronicle, published at Clarendon, Va., we take the following excerpts of an editorial written by Crandal Mackey, formerly commonwealth attorney for his State:

"The recent statement of FREDERICK VINSON, of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, that Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, would not be overpaid if his salary were raised to \$50,000 per year, is no more than others in Congress have said about that remarkable man.

"BLANTON, during his long service in Congress, has blocked more bad legislation than any other Member. Nothing escapes his vision.

"He has put through more good legislation than any other Member.

"BLANTON is always in his seat when Congress opens and has never been known to miss a roll call. He is always the first to arrive at a committee meeting and always knows to the greatest detail every matter that comes up for consideration. He has been rightly called a locomotive in trousers for he never stops day or night until exhaustion tells him: 'Something accomplished, something done, has earned a night's repose.'

"There is no man in Congress more familiar with parliamentary laws, practice, and procedure, and BLANTON uses this knowledge often with surprising results. BLANTON knows more ways for obstructing and defeating bad legislation than any Member of the House. His achievements along that line would fill a big book. He is the terror of the Treasury raider.

"With BLANTON everything is open and above board. With him candor is the courage of the soul. To know him is to hold him in the highest esteem and respect. Few men in public life are as unselfishly working for the good of others. His example is exalting and inspiring to those who seek honesty and purity in public and private life. His influence in Congress has steadily grown until he is now one of the most powerful leaders."

Brown County people have cast their last ballots for Mr. BLANTON, unless he becomes a candidate for some other office than congressional Representative, but they have appreciated his faithful service and will continue to be interested in his political success. The recent redistricting measure took this and neighboring counties out of his district, but did not sever the ties of friendship or the bonds of gratitude that hold the people here to him.

Such expressions, Mr. Chairman, from men like Jim White, showing appreciation for earnest service, is the most valuable remuneration for our work here that we receive. Evidently Raymond Brooks did not go to Brownwood when he was making his hired prognostications.

#### COKE COUNTY STOLEN FROM ME IN 1917

In the 1917 gerrymander Coke County was 1 of the 49 counties taken away from me by the politician legislature. Bronte is its largest city. I quote the following from the Bronte Enterprise, in its issue of February 16, 1934:

#### BLANTON DAUNTLESS, UNIMPEACHABLE, ASSERTS UPSHAW, EX-CONGRESSMAN

A far away but vigorous tribute to THOMAS L. BLANTON, Seventeenth District Congressman, is conveyed in the appended letter to Dr. T. S. Knox, Abilene, handed to the Reporter-News for publication. The writer, William D. Upshaw, is a former Member of Congress from Georgia. The letter, dated Washington, D.C., follows:

MY DEAR DR. KNOX: Having one time held an evangelistic meeting with my golden-hearted friend, Dr. M. A. Jenkins, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Abilene, plus several other public addresses there, plus also inspirational speeches to the schools and colleges there, I have come to think of Abilene as holding sort of inside track in my heart among all Texas communities.

Therefore I feel like congratulating you on being the pastor of Abilene's outstanding citizen and one of the Nation's greatest lawmakers, Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON.

I learn from a Texas friend that BLANTON has vigorous opposition at the next election. I know nothing of the men who oppose him; but I do know THOMAS L. BLANTON as a stainless, fearless, resourceful statesman, who during our 8 years together in Congress not only voted on the right side of every moral question but who fought with vigilant fidelity for every form of constructive legislation. He has been known for years as the watch dog of the Treasury, saving hundreds of thousands, indeed millions, of dollars from unworthy appropriations.

But in spite of his truceless warfare against everything he conceives to be wrong, he has grown increasingly popular with best Members on both sides of the House, for they honor him as a leader of dauntless courage and unimpeachable character. The defeat of such a man would be a public calamity, and I hope the people of his district will continue to make their splendid contribution to the Nation by guaranteeing his triumphant reelection. (Signed) WM. D. UPSHAW.

#### Abilene Reporter.

Editor's note: The Enterprise reproduces the above for two reasons: First, while Bronte is not in the Seventeenth Congressional District, Blackwell is. We have a goodly number of readers in Blackwell and the Blackwell community. Blackwell is in the Seventeenth District. Judge BLANTON has many friends in the Blackwell country, some of whom requested the above article be inserted in the columns of the Enterprise, which we are glad to do. Then, too, the Enterprise editor has known W. D. Upshaw for many years. Nearly 40 years ago he was a guest in our home—he was "Earnest Willie" then, "the cripple boy lecturer", who traveled about in his armed wheel chair—that was long before he dreamed of Congress, perhaps. His first book, Echoes from a Recluse, was an inspiration to us in our younger life and lingers with us still.

Incidentally, we were in his home city, Atlanta, Ga., the night he went away to Washington to take his seat in Congress. We

went to the station that night, with the thousands of his other friends, to see him off for Washington. He wore a homespun suit of clothes, given him by admiring friends. So impressed were we with the simplicity and sincerity of this great man—(great not only as an intellectual genius, but great in gentility and nobility of character and loftiness of ideals, both in his private and public life)—that we drafted some verses and printed in our newspaper, which we were editing in a central Texas city at that time. We forwarded him a copy of the issue containing the verses, entitled, "The Congressman in the Homespun Clothes." One of the most appreciated letters we ever had from anyone as a friend came in response to the verses. So, did we not know Judge BLANTON, the above lines from W. D. Upshaw would be all the commendation for us to underwrite for him without limit. But we know Judge BLANTON—and it would take a mighty strong lineup, if we resided in his district, to keep us from following him to "the jumping-off place." And, generally, after his political enemies have finished pouring out their wrath upon him, they have to come back and say, "We find no fault in this man—except we can't control him, nor get him to do only as he conceives to be right and honorable and for the country's good."

LETTER FROM FORMER STEPHENS COUNTY JUROR

Written from Sweetwater on March 25, 1934, I received the following letter from a substantial citizen:

DEAR JUDGE BLANTON: I am now living in Sweetwater. You will remember that I used to serve on your juries at Breckenridge. I have often thought how different court is run there now. Judge Hamlin isn't busy a fourth of his time. He has been running all over your district campaigning.

During the past 2 days there has been a convention of county commissioners here. Judge Hamlin had two of his Stephens County commissioners here campaigning their entire time. I enclose you one of his cards they were giving out here. Hamlin states on these campaign cards that you were repudiated in the last election by certain counties in your new district. That was all these two commissioners could talk about.

They didn't tell the people about the dirty campaign Jones made, or the lies he told all over your district while you were busy in Washington, or about the full-page ads. carried right at the last in the Fort Worth papers, or that you didn't have time to campaign your district. And they didn't mention the big majority your home county gave you.

I know that Judge Hamlin made a secret campaign against you in the last campaign both in Stephens County and in Palo Pinto County and did everything he could to beat you. I didn't understand it then. But since I have learned about his being cut off from his clabber and you keeping him from getting his \$150 per month from the Government, I now understand it.

LETTER FROM FISHER COUNTY

I received the following letter from a good citizen of Fisher County:

DEAR JUDGE BLANTON: I want you to know that your old friends here will stand by you. Both Chastain and Judge Hamlin are trying to get a line up here. Possibly it may interest you to know of the racket Hamlin has played in holding court for other judges away from his home county. He gets extra pay when he does it. Sometime ago he held court at Roby a few days for Judge Chapman, and if you will investigate it at Austin you will find that he collected \$34.85 from the State of Texas for extra allowance.

BUSY HERE IN WASHINGTON

I am busy here in Washington, Mr. Chairman, attending to the people's important business. I have no time for campaigning. I am kept on the grind 16 hours per day. None of us know yet just how much longer we will be kept here. There was a dirty, lying campaign made against me in my district in 1932. Much outside money was sent into my district to defeat me. Men were employed to make house to house canvasses against me in most of my counties. Every kind of a lie imaginable was told. I had no time to properly campaign my district after I reached Texas. I could only make a speech here and there. It was a great wonder that I was not defeated. Most of the county papers have not yet received their pay for my opponent's advertising.

Several like the Abilene Reporter-News and the Brownwood Bulletin had to bring suit. I am not going to allow unscrupulous politicians to repeat this year what was done in 1932. I am going to let the people know the facts. I am going to have printed at my own expense in a few days and send to my constituents a copy of the resolution passed by my last district Democratic convention for my district. Some of the leading citizens of my district were members of the resolutions committee and signed it. Until I can get to Texas I must rely upon my friends to look after my interests. If I had not made fights for the people here I would not have opposition.

LXXVIII—427

Mr. Chairman, after most of our hard work had been accomplished I took a few days' rest about the last of April 1933. On the few votes that occurred during my short absence I was paired with a Republican, so that my position was counted on every vote. The following shows that I was under obligations to our able Speaker, Hon. HENRY T. RAINY, for these few days of rest:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1933.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR TOM: Congress has been running at a very high rate of speed. I am warned by the House physician that a number of Members are overtaxing themselves.

I have been watching you and your work. You are overworking. You are rendering a splendid service. I know of no one who works harder than you. For the next few weeks there will not be so many important measures coming up, so I suggest that toward the end of the month you take a rest. I sincerely hope that you will accept this suggestion in the spirit in which it is intended.

Very truly yours,

HENRY T. RAINY.

And including the above, the following letters, Mr. Speaker, are among my most valuable possessions:

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1933.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR TOM: As we approach the close of the session, I do not wish to fail to express my deep appreciation for your kindness and valuable support.

In this connection, may I say that during all my long service I have never served with a Member who was more diligent in his effort to render real service to the people, not only of his district but of the entire Nation, and who watched appropriations and expenditures more closely than yourself. It will never be known just how much money you have saved to the people by your watchful care, your ability, as well as your close knowledge of parliamentary procedure and governmental affairs. It has enabled you to render a real and a great service.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely yours,

JO BYRNS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1933.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House Office Building.

DEAR TOM: I am familiar with the splendid record you have made in Congress and as a member of the Appropriations Committee for economy, and I wish to join with our Democratic majority leader, Hon. JO BYRNS; Democratic Chairman CANNON, of the subcommittee; and Hon. JOHN BOYLAN, of New York, in their commendation of your services.

You will recall that just before the Republican Administration expired, on March 3, 1933, the District appropriation bill was pending in conference and you refused to sign the conference report because you thought the amount carried in the bill constituted too great a burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation. The night before Congress adjourned you led the fight against this bill and succeeded in defeating the approval of the conference report. Your act in that fight has been vindicated by the President, and by the Democratic Congress, who reduced the Budget and this appropriation bill in accord with your contentions, thus saving over \$6,000,000 in this bill alone.

I am not unmindful of the fact that you and I have never agreed upon prohibition, that you are a pro and I am an anti, but this question should be relegated to second place when it comes in conflict with the crying need of reduction and retrenchment of the enormous expenditures of our Federal Government.

I commend you for your many accomplishments and your great energy in the interest of economy.

Your friend,

JAMES P. BUCHANAN,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,  
COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION,  
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1933.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House Office Building.

DEAR TOM: When you go home, I want you to tell those ex-service men for me that they will make a serious mistake if they turn against you after all you have done for them, and especially will do themselves an injury if they help to deprive themselves of the benefit of your services in the future.

Assuring you of my very kindest regards and best wishes at all times, I remain,

Sincerely your friend

J. E. RANKIN,  
Chairman of Committee.



From Postmaster General James A. Farley:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1933.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House Office Building.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want you to know that I greatly appreciate the support you gave the administration program during the session just closed. I feel certain the people of the country generally realize that more beneficial legislation was passed at this session of Congress than ever before in the Nation's history.

For the part you played in these remarkable accomplishments I want you to know that I am personally grateful.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely,

JAMES A. FARLEY, Chairman.

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1933.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I realize you hardly know me, as my first service in Congress began last December, when I succeeded Judge Crisp as Representative from the Third District of Georgia.

I have carefully considered and critically analyzed all proposed legislation and listened attentively to practically every argument and colloquy occurring in the House since my entry into Congress, and it is my candid opinion that your untiring efforts in behalf of economy during this period of our greatest distress deserves grateful recognition by the Nation and the plaudits of our people.

May you live long to continue the splendid service which so few are disposed or capable of rendering.

Very truly yours,

B. T. CASTELLOW.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and yield 10 minutes to my friend from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE].

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], whose sincerity of purpose no man can question, and I a few moments ago had a lapse of memory as to how each of us voted on the discharge rule when it was adopted. I overlooked the fact that I was bound by caucus action, and of course voted for the rule against my better judgment. I stated to the gentleman that I had not done so, thinking I was correct. On examination of the RECORD I recall the circumstances under which the vote was cast. Now, in order that the gentleman's record may be cleared, I think it but fair to state that the RECORD on the next page to which he referred reveals that the gentleman himself also voted for that rule. We were both in error when we said we voted against it. Like myself he condemns it and is ready to amend it. I repeat, nothing this House has done can hinder it or hamper its proper functions more than this foolish discharge rule. I recognize that it was put in effect under the leadership of my own party, but I venture the assertion that a majority of the gentlemen sitting on the Democratic side, after having seen its operation here, are now ready and willing and anxious to amend the discharge rule. What I wanted was to find out, if I could, how many gentlemen on the Republican side, some of whom may say they did not vote for it but who did, and who, like us, have seen its effect, are now willing to join the majority on this side for the amendment of the rule. The vote adopting the rule was overwhelming—only seven votes against the resolution.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. During the course of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the gentleman from Alabama directed an inquiry to him as to whether he might anticipate the support of the minority for the elimination of the rule. May I suggest to the gentleman that during the course of the sessions of the House thus far all of the gag rules that were required for the administration program have been supported by the majority side and carried in spite of the protestations of the minority. Is not that true? So that gentlemen on the Democratic side could carry this thing through, even though we Republicans refused to join with them.

Mr. McDUFFIE. On both sides of the aisle, when it comes to gag rules, probably you will find that honors are even, if the gentleman will look up the record. Sometimes it is necessary in a body as large as this to have gag rules. The party charged with responsibility should not be embarrassed in discharging that responsibility, and often is called upon

to do things which it does not especially enjoy doing, such as operating under gag rules. The gentleman's side has done it, and my side has done it.

Much has been said here about the publication in certain newspapers of the names of those gentlemen who have signed petitions under this discharge rule. If it is against any rule of this House to publish names of those who sign a petition let us abandon that rule. I am not so sure but this House puts itself in an unfortunate attitude before the country if we protest against the public knowing of our actions on this floor. The petition is a public document, and men who sign the petition should not object to the public knowing that they signed it. If it be against any rule of this House for the public to know who signs the petitions, such a rule itself should be eliminated. Certainly Members of this House should not conceal or hide their signatures to a petition to discharge a committee.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that the rules do not prevent these names from being published? There is nothing in the rule itself to prevent the publicity of the names on this petition.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I agree with the gentleman, but aside from that I can see no reason why any gentleman should object to having the public know that he had put his name on one of these petitions.

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly not; and it ought to be a public document.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And it is. There are now more than 20 petitions on file awaiting signatures. So much for that. We have found on our side a majority, I believe, who feel that the rule is unworkable, that it does not make for orderly processes of legislation, and who will vote to amend it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. In a moment. We are ready to amend the rule, but a majority of the Democrats cannot do it without some aid from the Republicans, such as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who says that he is ready and willing now to vote to amend the rule.

On this side of the aisle I think it should be said that when we find we have made a mistake or committed an error, we wish to correct it. The trouble about the gentleman's side of the aisle is that it does not correct its mistakes. I am not speaking about mistakes the gentleman may have made, I am speaking of the gentleman's side of the aisle, the gentleman's party.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I will yield if the gentleman can get me more time.

Mr. DITTER. I shall be pleased to give the gentleman sufficient time to answer the question.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman spoke about us not recalling how we voted on this rule; it is difficult sometimes to remember back 2 or 3 years, but may I say to the gentleman that even today to the lay mind, to the mind of the man not legally trained, all the rules of the House are not easily understood. A great many of the Members are lawyers, but a great many others are not.

After we Republicans voted against the previous question, then we put the matter of permitting 145 signers to discharge a committee up to the Democratic Party who wanted the rule. Notwithstanding the fact that the Democratic administration, when I first came in here, did everything under the heavens to harass the Hoover administration, we wanted to give them the opportunity to do that which they thought would be the best thing to do when they came into power. We did not want to hamstring President Roosevelt as the Democrats hamstringing former President Hoover, because it was not the proper thing to do; it was unjust; and we Republicans would not do that to our President today. We believe in helping our President when he is right but will oppose him only when he is wrong.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman from Alabama subscribe to all that?

Mr. McDUFFIE. No; but I think it is well to let the gentleman from Pennsylvania finish his statement, for he says a layman has difficulty at times in understanding the rules and what he should do, and I want to help him. I have not the time now to discuss the measure of cooperation Mr. Hoover received. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. RICH. I want to help the gentleman's side of the House so the gentleman's party can enact legislation that is going to be for the benefit of America and not be a matter of politics.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman's purposes are very high, and, of course, I am willing to join the gentleman in all sincerity in carrying out his very high motives. Unfortunately, this is a political body; and if the gentleman has come here from Pennsylvania thinking that he has come to a body that is not political, indeed he does need to learn a great deal. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I yield.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Is it the gentleman's purpose to change the rule so that a majority would be required to discharge a committee?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes; but I understand our leadership believes this rule is a bad one. I am not speaking for the leadership on our side. My idea, of course, is that when a majority of the House expresses itself in favor of considering any measure, then that measure should be considered, and not otherwise.

May I repeat what I said the other day: We are drifting toward government by petition; government by blocs and minorities; and I think all fair-minded Members on both sides of the aisle will agree that this does not make for the welfare of this great Government of ours. Whenever a majority of the Members of the House, be they Republicans or Democrats, say that any bill should be considered, then it is the expression of the will, I take it, of the majority sentiment of the American people. But when only 145 Members of 435, by petition, can work their will and take up the time of the House to consider what they think proper and what is demanded by organized interests back home, regardless of the will of the majority, that, I say, is not the proper way to legislate. Again I appeal for the modification of this rule.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is it not a fact that the present rule provides that 145 Members may force a vote on the question of discharging a committee?

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is right.

Mr. DITTER. But even under the present rule the committee is not discharged unless the majority want to discharge it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes; the first vote for or against discharging a committee generally reflects the views of the majority of the House on the measure asked for by petition of the House. It, of course, makes a record.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is true only if a majority wants to consider the bill. There is no possible chance of the bill's being given consideration even under the present discharge rule, for it merely makes possible consideration of the question of discharging a committee when 145 Members sign the petition.

Mr. McDUFFIE. A bloc of only 145 Members should not have the power to force a vote on any measure, but aside from that, the gentleman knows that the committees of this House fairly represent the sentiment of this country.

Mr. BOILEAU. That was not the case with the bonus petition, for instance.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And the gentleman knows that for all practical purposes if measures come here approved by a majority of the Members in this House or if a majority deems them wise measures, they will receive the attention of

the committees. Some of the best work done by the committees of Congress, in my judgment, is stifling bills that are unwise, that are not for the general good of all the people, and that should not be passed.

Mr. BOILEAU. That was not the case with the bonus petition. The majority of the House wanted the bonus bill but could not get it out of the committee.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That may be true.

Mr. BOILEAU. And if we had not had the 145 discharge rule, the gentleman knows we would never have gotten that bill out for consideration. Without this discharge rule legislation would be suppressed. That is the trouble.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman has no fear of any vote he might cast here?

Mr. BOILEAU. No; I have not one.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Not one! I congratulate the gentleman, for his is a rare experience. The gentleman knows that question after question may or can be presented here under this discharge rule, which serves only to embarrass those on the gentleman's side as well as those on this side.

Mr. BOILEAU. A Member of the House should be willing to stand by his convictions.

Mr. McDUFFIE. A majority of the Members may not be interested in questions presented by petition of 145 and may not wish favorable action upon them. Important business of the House may be hindered and unwise legislation may be passed. Legislation by petition is wrong, regardless of embarrassment.

Mr. BOILEAU. The mere matter of embarrassment is not justification for refusing to vote.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am one of those who voted against the rule.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman had better look at the RECORD. If the gentleman did, he is one of seven, if I remember correctly.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am one of seven, I think. I am sorry that the action taken by the Democrats at that time has risen to haunt them, but I am glad to support an amendment to that rule.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. May I say that it is understood that the conference report on the Bankhead cotton control bill will come up immediately after the gentleman concludes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, under our existing form of government it rests with the Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia. It is a responsibility which I do not feel is welcomed by the national lawmakers but, at the same time, one we cannot shirk. In times such as we are now experiencing, there is little time for the Representative or Senator to look after the many problems confronting the District. Monday a week ago was District Day; that is the regular day set aside for the consideration of legislation affecting the District of Columbia. Nearly a score of bills were on the calendar. Outside the 21 Members on the District Committee I doubt if there were a half dozen of the remaining 414 Members in the House who had ever read one of the bills. I confess I had never before Monday even looked at one of the measures, not because I am not interested in the welfare of the District and its citizens, but because my time has been taken up with other matters directly affecting the people of my State.

The members of the House District Committee are all hard-working, conscientious legislators; they give their time to questions pertaining to District affairs, knowing this labor will be of no benefit to them in their district back home. Called upon to perform a duty they respond and I desire to emphasize, nothing I say today is to be construed in the least as a reflection upon Mrs. MARY NORTON, the chairwoman, and members of her committee.

Investigate the personnel of the District Committee and you will find some of the members are assigned to as many as four House committees. Who can expect under such conditions members of the committee can give the time to District affairs they would like.



Under the rules of the House, the second and fourth Mondays are set aside as District days, but at the close of a session you will find the leaders have permitted the committee to have recognition not more than 5 or 6 days. The result is that when the committee does get its day Mrs. NORTON is required to call up the bills that are least controversial.

I have referred to this condition solely as justification for my consuming time today on a subject of great importance, not only to the District but also residents of nearby Maryland and Virginia.

As a result of over 20 years' residence in Washington, I have a large number of friends who reside here. I am pleased to be able to call the Commissioners, Mr. Hazen, Mr. Allen, and Major Gotwals, close personal friends. I became intimately acquainted with Major Gotwals when he served as district engineer of the Army Engineer Corps and was stationed in my home city, St. Louis.

It has been my custom to call on Major Gotwals New Year's Day. When I visited his home last New Year's, I found him standing at a table covered with maps and papers hard at work. After greeting me Major Gotwals said:

I am trying to solve a problem, one most interesting to me from an engineer's standpoint but far more important to official Washington, as well as to the people of this city and adjoining States, because it has a direct bearing upon their health.

I became interested immediately, and we talked at length upon the disposal of sewage in the Potomac River.

Having spent considerable time on the river and being an ardent fisherman, I had long known that the sewage in the river had practically eliminated fish from nearby waters, and the fish caught were not fit for consumption. I was also aware the river abutting the District and below for many miles was condemned by the natives as being unfit for bathing purposes; but this was the first time I had been advised that the health of the citizens of the District, as well as of the hundreds of thousands who visit the Capital annually, was in jeopardy.

The District of Columbia has had many competent Engineer Commissioners but none more competent nor any who have endeared themselves more to the people of Washington than Maj. John C. Gotwals. Knowing him as I do, I was impressed with his sincerity, and I will ever remember when he said to me:

Congressman, the day is sure to come that Congress as well as the people of the District will regret it if something is not done within a short time in reference to the sewerage, and sewage disposal, of the District of Columbia and adjoining territory.

Aware that Major Gotwals' term as Engineer Commissioner would expire this summer, that if Congress or some other Government agency did provide for the project he would probably have nothing to do with its construction, I asked him why he was so intensely interested. He replied that he fully understood the conditions, felt in time it would strike at the health of the community, and considered it his duty to let those in authority know of the conditions.

I have made some investigation, and being convinced a menace to the health of everyone residing here, from the President down, does exist, I am calling it to the attention of the Congress.

In my quest for information I found a report of an investigation made by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of conditions resulting from the present method of the disposing of sewage in the Potomac River. It was in response to a Senate resolution, Senate Document 172, Seventy-second Congress, second session. The report contains 65 pages, but I will quote only the "Summary and Conclusions", which follow:

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In compliance with Senate Resolution No. 44 of March 11, 1932, requesting that the United States Public Health Service make an investigation of conditions resulting from the present method of disposing of sewage from the District of Columbia into the Potomac River, a study was conducted during the summer of 1932 which included the collection of many water samples for chemical and bacteriological examination from the watercourses in and about Washington; the tabulation of data relative to stream flow in the Potomac River, above Washington; studies of rainfall

statistics and elevations and times of high and low tide in the river; and a survey of the sources of pollution on the watershed.

The survey was conducted when the discharge from the watershed was below the general average but representative of what may be expected during a considerable period of time in the future. The results obtained during the past summer are therefore indicative of probable conditions in the river for a considerable portion of the time during the summer season.

In response to the specific questions propounded in the Senate resolution the investigation has indicated that—

1. During the summer months of decreased stream flow and high-water temperatures the concentration of sewage bacteria in the entire river system from Little Falls Creek on the upper Potomac River and for the entire length of the Anacostia River within the District of Columbia, downstream to about Fort Foote, is such that the water is unsafe for bathing and constitutes a menace to public health from the standpoint of contracting sewage-borne diseases if bathing in the river is to be permitted.

2. Between Fort Foote and Hallowing Point there is a questionable area, the extent of pollution and its effect on bathing beaches depending upon the volume of discharge, which governs times of flow, which in turn affects rates of natural purification.

3. Below Hallowing Point sewage from the Washington area has no sanitary significance during the summer months when the river is used for bathing and other recreational purposes.

4. In the section of the Potomac River from a point between the sewer outlet and Fort Foote (the exact location depending upon the volume of flow in the river) to the vicinity of the railroad bridge above Hains Point, and in the Anacostia River to the District of Columbia-Maryland line, there exists a zone in which the dissolved oxygen is reduced to such an extent that critical conditions are reached in the summer months when the run-off from the upper watershed decreases to between 1,000 and 3,000 second-feet. With normal increases in population and an additional sewage load in the river, critical oxygen conditions will occur more frequently and be of longer duration. With complete exhaustion of the dissolved oxygen, anaerobic conditions will prevail at times, becoming more frequent with increased sewage pollution, and the gaseous decomposition products will cause odors and annoyances to residents and to persons using the park facilities along the river.

5. The oxygen content of the water for a considerable distance below the sewer outlets during the summer period was below that required for supporting fish life, and in a considerably larger area it is rapidly approaching similar conditions.

6. Below Fort Foote there appears to be sufficient dissolved oxygen at all times to support all the various forms of fish life.

7. The first oyster areas below Washington are located in the Wicomico River, nearly 70 miles below the sewer outlets, and are not affected by the Washington sewage, except possibly during periods of exceptional floods; and even under flood conditions it is believed that the pollution reaching this section of the Potomac River would in no way affect the oysters for human consumption.

In view of the conditions now existing in the Potomac River in the Washington metropolitan area, and in view of the fact that the study of proper methods of sewage disposal and the design and construction of sewerage works require a number of years, it appears essential, if it should be considered desirable to prevent the development of nuisances and make the river suitable for bathing and other recreational purposes and capable of supporting fish life during the summer, that the District of Columbia take steps toward providing the treatment of its sewage to relieve the constantly increasing sewage load reaching the river. The question as to whether the expense involved in the provision of sewage treatment required to meet these ends would be justifiable is a matter to be determined by the authorities who must assume responsibility for the expenditure of public funds. In view of the fact that no public water supply is now or is likely in the near future to be affected by pollution of the river in the vicinity of Washington, there appears to be at present no important public-health problem involved other than the use of local waters for bathing.

If it should not be considered justifiable to incur the expense necessary to reclaim the river for bathing purposes, this problem could be solved, of course, by prohibiting bathing in local waters.

In weighing the question as to whether the expense for sewage treatment is warranted at this time, the recreational value of the river, possible damage from pollution to private property adjoining the stream, and the probability that treatment ultimately will have to be provided—all should be taken into consideration.

Suitable methods of artificial sewage treatment are available for the purification of the sewage from the District of Columbia, should such purification be considered justifiable at this time. Should sewage treatment be deemed advisable, preliminary works should first be installed and placed in operation as soon as practicable. The estimated cost of complete treatment works is between \$8,000,000 and \$9,125,000.

In view of the magnitude of the works necessary, the design and construction of which require highly specialized training and experience, it would appear desirable to have available the services of one or more engineers, specialists in this subject, acting singly or as a board, to cooperate with the District sewer department engineers in the design and construction of the purification works.

I am told that if those responsible for that investigation and report are called before a congressional committee or a Government agency considering this project, some state-

ments bearing on the future health of the people of this community will be made that will be far stronger than those found in the report. When I asked why these views were not included in the report, I was advised the investigators did not want to alarm the people of the city.

As a result of the recommendation made in the report I just referred to and under a grant of \$40,000 by Public Works authorities, a board of sanitary engineers was appointed to determine the need for a treatment plant and to fix the type and capacity of such a structure. This board found the Potomac River so polluted with sewage as to be unattractive and at times of low flow in the warmer months offensive in appearance, low in dissolved oxygen, highly contaminated with sewage bacteria, and as a result of these conditions unsatisfactory for recreation and some other purposes for a distance of more than 20 miles downstream from the Anacostia River.

To remedy these conditions the board recommended that sewage from the city be purified to a high degree by the activated sludge process during the 6 warmer months of low river discharge and during the 6 cooler months to a lesser degree by plain sedimentation, and that the sludge obtained from this plant be processed and used to provide fertilizer and humus for the farm lands of the penal institutions at Lorton, Va. It was proposed to construct this plant on District-owned property at Blue Plains, D.C., at an estimated cost of \$8,000,000, and to operate it at an annual estimated cost of \$400,000 from District revenues under congressional appropriations.

A bill was presented by the Commissioners to the Bureau of the Budget for submission to Congress authorizing the construction outlined above, but was disapproved as not being in accord with the financial program of the President. However, just prior to this disapproval and in response to a request from the Public Works Administration, the Commissioners submitted as second in priority of four projects an item of \$8,000,000 for this treatment plant. No official reply has been received, but the newspapers under date of April 4 carried a story to the effect that all four projects had been disapproved pending availability of additional funds for such grants.

You see, so impressed were Secretary Ickes and his associates of the Public Works Administration, that this project warranted consideration, that it advanced \$40,000 to employ outstanding engineers to make an investigation.

The report will appear in three parts. Part I, consisting of 140 pages, contains a summary and recommendations which I will quote. It is as follows:

#### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of findings: The findings may be stated as follows:

1. The present method of sewage disposal by dilution is unsatisfactory because the Potomac River is badly polluted by the sewage discharged into it.

2. The population of the District of Columbia and certain small contiguous areas from which sewage probably will be discharged into District sewers is estimated at 650,000 and 850,000 as of 1950 and 1970, respectively.

3. The average volume of sewage to be treated is estimated at 200 gallons per capita per day, equivalent to 130,000,000 and 170,000,000 gallons per day as of 1950 and 1970, respectively.

4. The sewage as compared with that of other large cities is weak, because of the large per capita volume, but the per capita quantity of polluting matter is rather large.

5. Ordinarily the discharge of the Potomac River is low during the warmer months, averaging 3,000 cubic feet per second or less, during 50 percent of the time in July, August, and September, and falling to 706 cubic feet per second during the month of minimum flow of record.

6. If the biochemical oxygen demand of the sewage be reduced 90 percent by treatment, the dissolved oxygen in the river water will seldom be less than 50 percent saturation.

Summary of recommendations—it is recommended:

1. That a sewage-treatment plant be built forthwith on the site now owned by the District at Blue Plains, D.C.

2. That the treatment plant be built to serve a population of 650,000, estimated to be tributary about 1950, and so laid out that it can be enlarged to serve a population of at least 850,000, estimated to be tributary about 1970.

3. That the activated-sludge process of treatment be adopted.

4. That the activated-sludge treatment be suspended for the 6 cooler months of the year, during which the treatment will be by plain sedimentation.

5. That the sludge produced be digested in gas-tight heated tanks.

6. That the digested sludge be dewatered by means of vacuum filters.

7. That the dewatered sludge be taken to the District of Columbia penal institutions at Lorton, Va., and utilized for agricultural purposes.

8. That the gas produced by the digestion of the sludge be utilized for generating power for use at the treatment plant, and that the supplemental power, when required, be generated by Diesel engine-driven electric generators.

9. That the hot engine jacket water and the hot exhaust gases, supplemented when more convenient by gas from the digestion tanks, be utilized for heating the sludge undergoing digestion and for furnishing other heat about the plant where required.

#### RESULTS TO BE OBTAINED BY CARRYING OUT THE RECOMMENDED SEWAGE-DISPOSAL PROJECT

The efficient operation of the sewage-treatment plant herein recommended will produce the following results:

1. The present offensive appearance of the Potomac River will be eliminated.

2. The organic matter carried in suspension in the sewage will be removed to such a degree that extensive deposits of such matter will not be formed in the river and aid in depleting the natural supply of dissolved oxygen in the overlying water.

3. The organic matter in the sewage will be removed to such a degree that the dissolved oxygen in the river water will seldom fall below 50-percent saturation, and major forms of fish life will not be driven away because of lack of oxygen.

4. The present bacterial pollution of the river will be greatly reduced.

5. The river will be attractive in appearance and suitable for navigation, pleasure boating, fishing, and other uses.

6. The sludge produced will be utilized to advantage.

Although the District of Columbia does not have any jurisdiction over areas outside the District, it is assumed in predicting these results, that the sewage of the Washington Suburban Sanitary District, Arlington County, and the city of Alexandria will be so purified that it will not tend to offset and nullify the treatment of the sewage of the District of Columbia.

The greatly improved condition of the Potomac River water will affect favorably the water in the lower Anacostia River by eliminating the present tendency for polluted water to pass from the Potomac River into the Anacostia River with the incoming tides. The Anacostia River, however, has a very small flow during the warmer months, which makes it imperative that the sewage naturally tributary to it from the Washington Suburban Sanitary District be purified to a high degree so that this river will not be objectionable.

With the recommended sewage treatment, the river in and below the District will be much safer for bathing, which is carried on here and there to a limited extent. However, bathing will not be entirely safe on account of the necessary discharge from storm overflows, particularly in the vicinity of the outlets of the storm overflow conduits at times of discharge. It is impracticable to chlorinate or otherwise treat such discharges effectively.

The treatment of the sewage as herein recommended is consistent with the policy of the Federal Government in requiring that navigable waters shall be maintained in a condition which will not interfere with their reasonable use for navigation.

#### CONTRACT DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS

After it shall have been decided to proceed with construction it will be necessary to make additional surveys, borings, soil tests, and other preliminary investigations upon which to base the detail designs. It is estimated that a period of 9 months will be required for this preliminary work and for the preparation of designs, drawings, and specifications for the major features of the plant.

#### TIME REQUIRED TO BUILD PLANT

Many contracts will be required for the construction of the treatment plant. The first work to be undertaken would naturally consist of excavation and building the major structures. While this is going on the machinery and equipment could be built. Climatic conditions are such that construction can be carried out practically continuously throughout the year. It is estimated that a period of about 3 years from the date of award of the first construction contract will be required for the completion of the plant. Thus the total time from beginning of design to putting the plant into operation will be some 3 years 9 months, or say 4 years.

The estimate of the rate of expenditure during this period is as follows:

First year.....	\$500,000
Second year.....	2,000,000
Third year.....	3,000,000
Fourth year.....	2,500,000
Total.....	8,000,000

Respectfully submitted.

HARRISON P. EDDY,  
JOHN H. GREGORY,  
SAMUEL A. GREELEY,  
Board of Sanitary Engineers.

Mr. Eddy is considered one of the leading, if not the leading, sanitary engineers of the country, and resides in Boston.



Mr. Gregory, a professor from Johns Hopkins University, and Mr. Greeley from Chicago, are also sanitary engineers recognized throughout the country as outstanding along this particular line.

The Bureau of the Budget having for the time being refused to approve the project due to the financial condition of the Treasury, the Commissioners very properly have appealed to the Public Works Administration because the P.W.A. regulations provide specifically that sewage disposal is to be considered a preferential subject in the allocating of money.

The question of employment is also one for consideration in connection with P.W.A. projects. This plan, if undertaken, will furnish employment for 640 men working 3 full years, equivalent to 4,000,000 man-hours.

The Commissioners had a conference with Secretary Ickes and his aides Tuesday afternoon of last week. I have no knowledge of what occurred, but I am aware that when it is shown that it will require \$400,000 annually to maintain and operate such a plant, Secretary Ickes will desire to know where this money is coming from. To meet that situation I have today introduced a bill authorizing the Commissioners to construct the plant at a cost not to exceed \$8,000,000, and further authorizing such annual appropriations as may be required for maintenance and operation. The bill is short, and reads as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to remove objectionable sewage pollution from the Potomac River the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct in the District of Columbia, at Blue Plains, a sewage-treatment plant at a cost not to exceed \$8,000,000, and such annual appropriations as may be required for the maintenance and operation of said plant shall be made by Congress in the same manner as other appropriations are made for defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

Money has already been allocated to Arlington County, Va., by the P.W.A. for sewerage and sewage disposal, but I understand the county officials are waiting to see what is to be done by the District, feeling it is useless to proceed with their plant if the District is not authorized to construct its plant.

Maryland likewise has asked the P.W.A. for an appropriation for the Anacostia River.

Naturally the health of the people of the District is of paramount importance, but aside from that there are other benefits that will accrue if this project is carried out.

It is our duty to safeguard the health of Government officials. Let us say this condition existed in our own community. Is there a man or woman in the Congress who would not join in a movement with local officials to cure the condition? We should do the same by the people of Washington as we would do for those who send us to Congress. I submit the responsibility is ours and we should meet it.

A few weeks ago the House passed a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of 15 to be known as a "Conservation Committee" and providing that it cooperate with a committee of the Senate. Later, the House appropriated about \$10,000 to assist this committee in its investigation. I think the Senate committee has spent about \$50,000.

The purpose of this special committee in part is to submit to the Congress legislation that will stop the pollution of our streams, having in mind the harmful effects of pollution on fish life. The report of the Surgeon General as well as the report of the three sanitary engineers calls attention to this.

Here at our very door we find one of the greatest streams in the country, from a recreation standpoint, polluted by the sewage of the Nation's Capital to such an extent that it is practically devoid of fish life, only the more hardy fish finding it possible to survive.

Can we ask the States to stop the pollution of streams when we permit such a condition to exist?

Few cities in this country have such facilities for recreation at its front door as the Potomac affords.

Stop this pollution and summer resorts will spring up overnight on the shores of the Potomac. The land abutting the river will increase in price far above the cost of the project. The people of Washington will spend their money at home rather than travel miles to find a suitable place for bathing. Where there is one motorboat on the river now you will find a hundred and a thousand fishermen will angle in the river where one fishes now.

Let us get behind this project, conserve the health of the people of Washington, and at the same time exploit the recreational facilities of this great river that abuts the Capital of the Nation.

Let us do for Washington what we would do for our own people back home if a similar situation existed there. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is making an interesting statement about public health in the District of Columbia. May I ask whether or not anything is being done, either by the District authorities or by the Congress, in relation to the incineration of garbage?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I think the present bill takes care of the matter.

Mr. TREADWAY. Was not the question brought up at one time before the Congress and then abandoned later?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I think it was, but if I am not mistaken there is some reference to that in the present bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. I hope that is being considered, because if there is one thing in the District that is disgraceful as well as insanitary it is the burning of refuse right across the river.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That is taken care of, I am positive, in the present bill. It is restored.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says that the Public Works Administration would have to advance 100 percent of the money for the construction of this plant. Is not this a 100-percent American town?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I hope it is.

Mr. RICH. Then why should they not do that?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I hope the Public Works Administration will take that view of the matter. This city is the Capital of the Nation, and, as such, I feel Mr. Ickes would be justified in making this an all-Federal project.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the gentleman know of any other city as large as Washington where the untreated sewage is emptied into a navigable stream?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am sure the gentleman from Texas could answer that question better than I can. Personally I do not know of any city.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In my own district the P.W.A. has allocated money for a sewage-disposal plant, and I would like to ask the gentleman a question which may help him with his bill. Do not the adjoining States that border on the Potomac River have laws stopping the pollution of these streams by a certain time? We have such a law in our own State and in the neighboring State of Massachusetts.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. This is a navigable stream and is under the control of the United States. The adjoining communities have been allocated money by the P.W.A.

to dispose of their sewage, but they are waiting to see what the District does.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And it is an interstate stream?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes; it is an interstate stream.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FOCHT. Has there been any change in the handling of the sewage or garbage which is carried down below the War College and discharged into the river at that point? I am referring to a condition which I know existed when I was chairman of the committee that had charge of this matter. The sewage then went down below the bridges in large conduits and then out into the Potomac River, and the garbage was sold to contractors. Is this the way the matter is handled now?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. No; they have no way of disposing of the garbage at all at this time other than to sell a small amount to farmers.

Mr. FOCHT. They sell it to contractors, I understand.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. A small amount to farmers only, but I am referring to the general sewage which pollutes the stream for as far as 50 miles below Washington, according to the report which you will find in the Record.

Mr. FOCHT. It may pollute the stream, but, as the Supreme Court has declared with respect to the coal dirt in Pennsylvania, it may be an unavoidable necessity. If that is the case, what is the gentleman going to do about it?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It is not unavoidable, because Major Gotwals has shown just how the matter can be handled. If it can be taken care of it is not an unavoidable necessity.

Mr. FOCHT. By taking it out to the salted sea, which is the only way it can be handled?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. No; it can be handled here by building a disposal plant. The reports show that the engineers say it can be done.

Mr. FOCHT. That cannot take care of the sewage and garbage and the storm water.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Why, certainly it can; the best engineers obtainable say so. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a better engineer than Major Gotwals.

Mr. FOCHT. I hope I would be better than a good many that I have known around here.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If the gentleman will get acquainted with the District Engineer Commissioner he will find that he knows something about the sanitary conditions here, after serving the District for many years. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SEARS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9061, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PLACE COTTON INDUSTRY ON SOUND COMMERCIAL BASIS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8402) to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practice in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill

(H.R. 8402) to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 9, 10, and 19, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert a comma and the following: "but if the President finds that the economic emergency in cotton production and marketing will continue or is likely to continue to exist so that the application of this act with respect to the crop year 1935-36 is imperative in order to carry out the policy declared in section 1, he shall so proclaim, and this act shall be effective with respect to the crop year 1935-36. If at any time prior to the end of the crop year 1935-36 the President finds that the economic emergency in cotton production and marketing has ceased to exist, he shall so proclaim, and no tax under this act shall be levied with respect to cotton harvested after the effective date of such proclamation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert a comma and the following: "for the crop year 1935-36, if the provisions of this act are effective for such crop year, that two thirds of the persons who have the legal or equitable right as owner, tenant, share-cropper, or otherwise to produce cotton on any cotton farm, or part thereof, in the United States for such crop year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "\$1,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 6 months, or both"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert:

"SEC. 24. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to develop new and extended uses for cotton, and for such purpose there is authorized to be made available to the Secretary not to exceed \$500,000 out of the funds available to him under section 12 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

MARVIN JONES,  
H. P. FULMER,  
WALL DOXEY,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
J. ROLAND KINZER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

E. D. SMITH,  
J. H. BANKHEAD,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amend-



ments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8402) to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendments nos. 1 and 3: These amendments strike out the provisions of the House bill which make the proposed bill effective for the crop year 1935-36 and which authorize the extension of its provisions for the crop year 1936-37. Amendment no. 1 also strikes out the provision authorizing termination of the bill at any time.

The House recedes with an amendment on amendment no. 1, the effect of which is to make the bill applicable during the crop year 1934-35, to authorize its extension by the President so that it may be applicable during the crop year 1935-36, and to retain the provision of the House bill authorizing the termination of its provisions at any time. Since under the conference agreement on amendment no. 1 the bill will not be applicable to the crop year 1936-37, the House recedes on amendment no. 3.

On amendment no. 2: This amendment strikes out the provision of the House bill providing for a finding by the Secretary of Agriculture that farmers favor a tax for the crop year 1935-36 and a similar finding for succeeding crop years. The amendment also requires a finding for the crop year 1934-35 which was not required under the House bill. See amendment no. 1. The amendment also substitutes for the provision of the House bill requiring a finding that two thirds of the persons who own, rent, share-crop, or control cotton land favor a ginning tax, a provision which requires that two thirds of the persons who have legal or equitable title as owner, tenant, share-cropper, or otherwise to produce cotton on any farm or part thereof for the succeeding crop year favor a ginning tax.

The conference agreement eliminates the finding for the crop year 1934-35, but requires it for the crop year 1935-36 if the bill is to be applicable for that year, and adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment on the finding itself.

On amendment no. 4: This amendment makes the rate of tax 75 percent of the average central price, rather than 50 percent, as contained in the House bill. See amendment no. 5. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 5: This amendment makes the minimum tax 8 cents per pound, rather than 5 cents per pound, as contained in the House bill; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 6: This amendment exempts from the tax all cotton having a staple of 1½ inches in length or longer. The House recedes.

On amendment no. 7: Under the House bill, the tax on nonexempt cotton was postponed until bale tags were secured for it, if the cotton was to be stored by the producer. Bale tags for such cotton could be secured upon payment of the tax or surrender of exemption certificates covering the cotton. This Senate amendment strikes out this provision. The amendment also provides that a producer harvesting more cotton than his allotment of tax-exempt cotton may, in a subsequent year when the tax is in effect, if he does not harvest in the subsequent year the amount of cotton for which he holds certificates, pay the ginning tax on the excess in the prior year with exemption certificates issued for the subsequent year. The amendment further provides that a producer to whom an exemption certificate is issued, who does not use it for the year issued by reason of his producing an amount of cotton less than that represented by the certificates, may use the unused certificate in a subsequent year when the allotment and tax are applicable. The Senate recedes, thus restoring the House provision which authorizes postponement of the payment of the tax and retaining the substance of the matter proposed

to be inserted by the Senate amendment which is covered in the language restored and in other provisions of the bill.

On amendment no. 8: Under the House bill, the allotment of tax-exempt cotton to each State was to be based upon the ratio of its average production for the 5 crop years preceding the enactment of the act to the average national production for the same period. This amendment makes both periods 10 years. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 9: This amendment provides a minimum allotment of 200,000 bales of tax-exempt cotton to each State if in any one of the 5 years preceding the enactment of the act the production of such State equaled 250,000 bales. The House recedes.

On amendment no. 10: Under the House bill no certificate or allotment was to be granted to a producer unless he agreed to comply with requirements to assure his cooperation in reduction programs and to prevent expansion of competitive production by him. This Senate amendment limits the provision so that the requirement preventing expansion of production relates only to expansion on lands leased by the Government. The House recedes.

On amendment no. 11: This amendment strikes out the exception contained in the House bill permitting transportation of cotton beyond the county of production for storage under section 4 (f), in conformity with Senate amendment no. 7, which eliminates the provision with respect to storage. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 12: This amendment reduces the criminal penalty for violation of section 12 (d) (relating to willful violations of the act, willful failure to pay tax, and other crimes) from a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, to a fine not exceeding \$100. The conference agreement makes the punishment a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both.

On amendments nos. 13 and 15: The House bill authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations to carry out the powers given him and provided a fine for violating such regulations. These Senate amendments authorize the Secretary to enact a penal statute to carry out such powers and make violation of the penal statute the offense. The Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment no. 14: This amendment provides that no producer shall be taxed or penalized in the ginning of his first six bales and further provides that the total allotment for the crop year 1934-35 shall not exceed 10,000,000 bales. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 16: This amendment reduces from 6 months to 30 days the time, after filing claim for refund of tax, prior to which no suit or proceeding by the taxpayer may be begun for the recovery of the tax paid. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 17: This amendment strikes out the provision of the House bill defining the term "bale" when used in describing a quantity of cotton as 500 pounds of lint cotton, and substitutes therefor a definition of bale as a package containing 500 pounds average gross weight of lint cotton and customary bagging and ties. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 18: This amendment strikes out the provision of the House bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase taxable cotton and to dispose of it for charitable purposes, in the development of new and extended uses for cotton, and for other purposes, and which authorized the making of appropriations of funds available to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 12 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The House recedes with an amendment which authorizes the Secretary to develop new and extended uses for cotton and which limits the amount which is authorized to be appropriated from the funds available under such section 12 to \$500,000.

On amendment no. 19: This amendment strikes out the amendment contained in the House bill to the Agricultural Adjustment Act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to

include in agreements made under section 8 (1) of that act provisions for the reduction of acreage or production for market of agricultural commodities. The House recedes.

MARVIN JONES,  
H. P. FULMER,  
WALL DOXEY,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
J. ROLAND KINZER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the conference report is self-explanatory. In the main the conference report embodies the provisions of the House bill. One change is that the operation of the bill is limited to 1 year, with the privilege of extending it 1 additional year upon proclamation by the President, providing two thirds of those, renters, share croppers, or otherwise, interested in the land, are favorable to such extension.

There is an amendment put in also which exempts long-staple cotton, because this country produces nothing like the amount that is needed.

The Johnson amendment, which provided that a State that produced as much as 250,000 bales should not be reduced below 200,000 bales is retained. The last provision in reference to the amendment of the triple A act, pertaining to competitive crops, is eliminated. The so-called "Boileau amendment", which provided that there shall be no expansion in competitive crops, is retained in the bill, with a qualification limiting its application to lands leased by the Government. The whole cotton-reduction program is based on land leasing. In other words, they will not be permitted to use the land thus leased for competitive crops.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. I understand the bill as framed now is limited to 1 year. When we had the discussion in the House, if I remember correctly, the gentleman from Texas said that, if limited to 1 year, it would be inoperative and of no value.

Mr. JONES. No. I stated in order to have the full effect, to have it work properly, we should have it for longer than 1 year. So we now provide that it may be extended the second year if it appears needed and the President so decides. We retain the House provision, but omit the middle year. In the original House bill, in order to extend it the second year, it was required that two thirds of those engaged in production should favor it. In other words, the original act provided that it was for 1 year, with the privilege of extending it 1 year, and then a third year in addition, by proclamation of the President.

We have omitted the middle year and given them the privilege of extending it the second year in the same manner that it could have been extended the third year by proclamation of the President.

Mr. SNELL. What is the amendment of section 24?

Mr. JONES. Under the original House bill, the Secretary of Agriculture was permitted to use any of the cotton funds under the triple A act in the purchase of cotton subject to taxation, and use it in a search for new and extended uses of cotton and its distribution. The Senate objected to that provision, but indicated that they had no objection to a search for new and extended uses of cotton. The Secretary under the conference bill is not authorized to purchase cotton. We modified it to that extent.

Mr. SNELL. What does the gentleman mean by new and extended uses? Does he mean in foreign countries?

Mr. JONES. It might be in foreign countries or in this country—any new channels in which cotton might be used. Practically all commodities of any consequence have some search made along those lines. For instance, there is the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., which has been doing research in new uses of forest products for many years, and has done very valuable work. A great many

people think that while a measure of this kind may be necessary to clear the decks of the overhanging surpluses that have been wrecking the market for the past few years, yet, as a long-range proposition, the question of the marketing and the fields and channels in which a great commodity of this kind must go is perhaps the most or, at least, a very important feature of any program.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, that is a great deal more than any one other industry has, is it not?

Mr. JONES. Oh, no. We appropriated at one time as much as \$800,000 for the Forest Products Laboratory. Besides, this comes out of the cotton funds, I will state to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Even if it does, it is a special fund.

Mr. JONES. I know; but if those who are to receive the benefits under the program, instead of receiving the benefits, would prefer that a small part of that fund should be used in searching for new and extended uses of the commodity, I do not see how anyone can object.

Mr. SNELL. Does it come out of a processing tax?

Mr. JONES. Yes, or out of the funds collected under this bill.

Mr. SNELL. The people who make paper bags up in my country have to pay for a processing tax and then have to pay for their share toward this tax.

Mr. JONES. It may come out of the taxes collected under this bill and probably will.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman admits that a lot of this money comes from people not directly interested in cotton.

Mr. JONES. Of course, if you have any tax, if you use the fund, you cannot say that somewhere along the line it will not touch somebody else. I cannot see how the gentleman can seriously object to a search for new markets for cotton.

Mr. SNELL. It depends on what the search is. It has been the policy of the administration not to search in foreign countries.

Mr. JONES. I do not agree with the gentleman. Then on that basis the cotton people could object to the forest products laboratory, because wood pulp and fiber rayon have for years been cutting into the channels used by cotton in the form of rayon and other commodities. You cannot have a national program where you will never approach or touch elbows with somebody else.

Mr. SNELL. Let me ask one more question. What proportion of cotton is already planted at this time?

Mr. JONES. That is a very difficult question to answer, but only a small percentage.

Mr. SNELL. I understood that at the time this bill passed the House, say, a month or 6 weeks ago, it had to be passed at once, because the cotton was practically planted at that time.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman is familiar with the geography of the United States, he will know that one part of Texas ranges pretty far south.

Mr. SNELL. I am familiar with what the gentleman said at that time, whether I am familiar with the geography of the United States or not.

Mr. JONES. And I say to the gentleman that they plant cotton from a month to 2 months earlier in that part of Texas than they do in my district.

Mr. SNELL. I am stating what the gentleman said on the floor of the House—that we would have to have it 6 weeks ago, or it would not do any good this year.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is evidently not familiar with the planting of cotton. I did not say it would not do any good. I did say that it was preferable to have it before any of the cotton was planted.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, I admit that I am not; but I am taking what the gentleman stated at that time.

Mr. JONES. I stated at that time—and I still stick to my guns—that they were planting cotton in south Texas, and if we came here 3 weeks from now, they would still be planting cotton in some parts of Texas.



Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I understood the gentleman from Texas, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], to say that the President cannot extend this act for another year without a two-thirds vote of the cotton producers?

Mr. JONES. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS. And I should like to have the gentleman discuss a little more in detail what noncompetitive crops may be planted on this surplus unused cotton land?

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is familiar with the cotton voluntary reduction program. The contracts call for a designation of those crops by the Department, and in each vicinity they will furnish information as to what crops may or may not be grown. The cotton program is an acreage-reduction program. It forbids their using idle land, which will probably amount to some 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 acres, in the expansion of any competitive crop or commodity.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wish the gentleman, in revising his remarks, would go a little more into this in detail, because the country is very much interested in that feature.

Mr. JONES. It is practically impossible to make a general statement that would cover the entire country on that. It is an administrative problem that must be varied somewhat in the different localities. I think, at least as a temporary matter, that the cotton people would be better off to have a program than not to have a program, even if they left those lands perfectly idle.

They are lands leased by the Government, and a man will be permitted to plant just what those administering it define as noncompetitive crops, and will be permitted to plant no other. The Government leases and pays for the land.

Mr. HASTINGS. Of course, the chairman of the committee knows that it is getting a little late in the season.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. And the farmers must know, and must know at once, what they can plant on these surplus lands.

Mr. JONES. All that has practically been determined by the voluntary program. A vast majority of the cotton producers have signed up on these voluntary programs, and they have practically the same provisions in the voluntary contracts which they will have under this plan. The Department has furnished people in all localities the essential information as to what they may plant, and I am sure that the information is in the hands of the county agents in the districts which the gentleman represents.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the planting of foodstuffs for use on the plantations and farms, is there?

Mr. JONES. Not for use by the people who own the land.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman inform us what penalties are provided in the bill at the present time for violation of its terms?

Mr. JONES. The penalties for violating the act which we talked about when we first had the measure under consideration range from a fine not exceeding \$1,000 to imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, and for violation of a regulation the penalty is a fine not exceeding \$200.

Mr. BUSBY. Does the gentleman mean that for violation of a regulation a person may be fined; that a man may be fined because he violates some regulation promulgated by the Department of Agriculture which regulation is not in this bill?

Mr. JONES. It must be a regulation authorized by the terms of this bill and within the four corners of this bill.

Mr. BUSBY. But it is to be pronounced by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JONES. Why, of course. The gentleman has never voted for any law that required any administration at all that did not provide for some regulation, because the gentleman knows that regulations are essential. The gentleman

knows further that were we to incorporate in a bill every regulation to carry out a program covering as wide a stretch of the country as this must necessarily cover we would have a wholly unworkable bill.

Mr. BUSBY. The gentleman from Texas knows that we construe penal laws strictly and we write the penal statutes verbatim into the law; but we do not instruct a lot of subordinates and bureaucrats to enact penal statutes under which people on farms may be sent to jail. The gentleman knows that. I should like to pursue the matter further. I notice an exemption is made in the case of cotton the staple of which is 1½ inches long.

Mr. JONES. There may be some of that in the gentleman's own State.

Mr. BUSBY. I do not care about that; what I am concerned with is that there should be an exemption of any cotton from taxation if cotton is to be taxed.

Mr. JONES. As the gentleman knows, there is a distinct field for long staple cotton, and even in times when we have had great surpluses of the ordinary variety of cotton in this country we import long-staple cotton to fill that particular field.

Mr. BUSBY. Why exempt it from this tax? Are not the growers of long-staple cotton cotton growers just like the others except they grow a higher-priced cotton?

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman want an answer to his question or does he just want to ask a lot of questions?

Mr. BUSBY. If the gentleman will yield me some time I will let him alone. Will the gentleman yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. JONES. I will yield the gentleman 5 minutes but I cannot yield the gentleman further time because I promised to take but a limited time in the discussion of this conference report. But first, however, I insist on answering the gentleman's question. There is a very limited acreage suitable for the growing of long-staple cotton.

Far less long-staple cotton is grown in the country than is consumed. There is no surplus problem of any kind connected with long-staple cotton, and this is an exemption of this particular type of cotton.

Mr. BUSBY. It is the creation of a special class.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas yields to me for the specific purpose of answering the question of the gentleman from Mississippi. The gentleman has reference to page 6 of the bill, amendment 4, made by the Senate:

Cotton having a staple of 1½ inches in length alone.

That amendment applies only to the State of Arizona. It is in its infancy in the production of cotton. This exemption covers only about 9,000 bales in the United States.

As to the argument that the exemption makes a special class, that does not fit the case, because in our State we have no cotton that will pull an inch and a half, and this long-staple cotton that is grown in Arizona enters into direct competition with Egyptian cotton; and there is no surplus of this grade of cotton.

Mr. BUSBY. Why should we do anything to encourage the production of cotton, when the very purpose of the bill is to curtail production?

Mr. JONES. In order to be fair to a struggling State in fostering a very promising infant industry.

Mr. BUSBY. One other question: Why exempt States that have not grown 1,000 bales of cotton over a 5-year period?

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman will find there are but two States affected by this provision.

Mr. BUSBY. But if the bill is designed to bring all cotton growers into line why exempt some of them?

Mr. JONES. Some of these States have gone into cotton production in comparatively recent years and there is no surplus in those States. They have become accustomed only in recent years to the production of cotton. In order to be

fair to all the different States it was necessary to go back over a range of years. Then to be fair to the newer States it was necessary to insert the provision referred to.

We went over that range of years in these particular States and they do not produce enough cotton to materially affect the program.

It is only to the effect that cotton may be reduced to between 125,000 and 150,000 bales in California. It will be limited to 200,000 at the most.

Mr. BUSBY. May I ask one more question? Was not the purpose in making these concessions to get support in the Senate so that the bill could be passed?

Mr. JONES. I am not authorized to speak on the motives of the Senate. I have been surprised by them many times. But it was not necessary in the House. I think we could pass it with or without the amendment.

Mr. BUSBY. Is the opposition going to have time to speak against the report?

Mr. JONES. I hope the gentleman will not insist on much time. I will give him some time.

Mr. BUSBY. How about 10 minutes?

Mr. JONES. I will give the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am very much interested in the amendment stricken out on page 25, the last section of the bill, amendment no. 19. As I understand it, that was passed by the House and stricken out in the Senate. Its object was to protect the growers of nonbasic agricultural products, such as are raised in New England, garden truck, fruit, poultry, milk, cheese, butter, eggs, and various items of that kind, the products of New England. I have a telegram from a group of New England farmers, representing the associations up there, bitterly opposing the opportunity the cotton growers will have of taking up land for products competitive to our nonbasic New England agricultural products. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the telegram referred to, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., April 6, 1934.

One hundred fifty representatives of poultry, potato, market-gardening, and fruit industries from six New England States in informal conference assembled here today. Urge the inclusion of an amendment to the Bankhead bill giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to prohibit signers of contracts on basic commodities from increasing production for sale of nonbasic commodities. We request that you communicate this action to Senators and Representatives from New England States and also inform conferees of action taken. This shall be in no way construed as an endorsement of other features of the Bankhead bill.

GEORGE M. PUTNAM,

President New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation.

What is the gentleman's idea as to why the amendment was not left in the bill?

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will turn to page 10, insofar as this bill is concerned, practically the same thing is accomplished. The particular amendment at the end is an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration generally.

Mr. TREADWAY. I realize that.

Mr. JONES. That was bitterly objected to by a great many people in different parts of the country.

Mr. TREADWAY. By whom?

Mr. JONES. It was not objected to by the southern people, I may say to the gentleman. The objection was made by the people from other sections of the country.

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly not by the people of New England.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will go to the RECORD he will find the Senators who objected, and they stated they did not want this to apply all along the line. The amendment that the gentleman is talking about is an amendment to the A.A.A. Act.

Mr. TREADWAY. I realize that.

Mr. JONES. We have the same thing insofar as this act is concerned.

Mr. TREADWAY. The language that is stricken out is very plain. We see exactly what it does. When we turn to page 10 there is a complication of language that might be interpreted most any old way by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. JONES. May I say further to the gentleman that the same provisions are in the cotton contracts that were signed under the voluntary program? The objection, I may say to the gentleman, was raised largely by people who were not from the South.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not possible under the law and under this bill as the gentleman expects it to be enacted, to substitute for the basic cotton the product of the lands you are withdrawing, nonbasic agricultural commodities?

Mr. JONES. Not of a competitive variety.

Mr. TREADWAY. What does the gentleman mean by "competitive variety"?

Mr. JONES. Anything that competes on a national scale. This will be determined largely by regulations of the Department, which must be adjusted in order to fit the whole agricultural program.

Mr. TREADWAY. Take Maine potatoes that go into the Boston and New York markets. They are competitive.

Mr. JONES. They are limited. I assume that situation will be covered. But I am not going to undertake to solve all of the problems of administration. I think those in charge will administer it in a way that will be fair to all concerned. At least, that will be their purpose.

Mr. TREADWAY. Take as an illustration what is ordinarily known as "garden truck."

Mr. JONES. I would not want to go into a field that I am not thoroughly versed in, but this will not permit competition on a commercial scale in connection with any of these articles. That is as far as I can go.

Mr. TREADWAY. But that does not cover the objections of the people I am in touch with.

Mr. JONES. I am sorry.

Mr. TREADWAY. When they are raising garden truck or have a hennery and ship eggs to New York, they do not know whether they are raising and marketing competitive or noncompetitive products.

Mr. JONES. I do not think the gentleman will have any complaint at all. The administration so far has not run into serious difficulties along that line. That is the best I can give the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I know the gentleman wants to deal in generalities. Our experience for the past year shows that is true.

Mr. JONES. The cotton contracts will still be in effect and this provision on page 10, in my judgment, the amendment by Mr. BOILEAU, is stronger than the one that has been stricken out.

Mr. TREADWAY. It does not cover nonbasic products.

Mr. JONES. There will not be anything taken away from the protection which the gentleman now has.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think that the farmers of this country are going to be well satisfied with the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to tell them what they shall do with their lands?

Mr. JONES. I do not know. I hope they will be satisfied with the program. I feel that if they lease their land to the Government under the voluntary program, which they have had a right to do, they certainly should not complain if the party that has leased and paid for the land has something to say about what goes on. I think they will be satisfied with it.

Mr. RICH. When the time comes that we try to tell the people of this country—agriculture of business—just what they can do, where will be the freedom of the citizens of this country?



Mr. JONES. Oh, nobody is advocating any such proposition. This can be ended at any time; and any time they manifest a desire to have this ended, that will be done.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCLINTIC. The distinguished chairman of the committee represents a section of country that is comparable with western Oklahoma. I am very much interested in the man who produces a small amount of cotton and I should like to get the gentleman's reaction to amendment no. 14, which sought to provide a minimum amount of cotton that could be produced by any individual farmer. I should like to have the gentleman's explanation of whether or not there could be allowed a minimum number of bales and if such a proposition would work out in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. JONES. I may state to the gentleman that those who have had charge of the cotton program heretofore regarded that as complicated and wholly unworkable. They felt there would be a terrible amount of work involved in determining just who was entitled to grow cotton and that it meant, practically, the same as striking out the enacting clause of the bill, in view of the great number who are engaged in the growing of cotton. There are some 2,000,000 such farmers, and if we gave them each six bales, of course, they would all claim their exemption, because they could dispose of their exemption tags. There may be some way of making 12,000,000 go into 10,000,000, but I was never able to find it in any arithmetic that I have studied.

In addition to this, there would be any number of people who, at some time, may have had land that had grown cotton and they would claim their exemption. This was regarded as wholly unworkable and if you have this only for 1 year, with a possibility of 2 years, I think the purpose can be accomplished better by having it as simplified as possible.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I wanted the gentleman to put that statement in the Record and I wish to make one further observation. In the section of the country I represent, which is similar to the section of the country that the gentleman from Texas represents, there are many who are capable of planting cotton that have not grown this crop in the past. Does the gentleman feel that the 5-year computation would have been better than the 10-year computation, taking into consideration the fact that the 10-year computation would have allowed new growers of cotton a little more leeway?

Mr. JONES. I may state to the gentleman it is impossible to answer that question categorically. There would be a little shade of difference when you take the different periods, but taking the country over it seemed this was about as fair a basis as we could get. We tried to safeguard the very proposition the gentleman is talking about by stipulating that 10 percent should be held back for the purpose of caring for the shift in population and for new production and I think this will take care of that situation insofar as possible. They are dovetailing this into the voluntary-allotment program and trying to fit it into that program. They wish to clear the decks and give us relief from the overhanging surplus which has heretofore tended to depress the market.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is the gentleman in position to give the House a short statement as to the number of acres that are now in cotton production and the amount it has been stated this will be increased this year, for the purpose of showing that unless there is some method to bring about a reduction of acreage, increased foreign production will have a marked effect upon domestic production in this country and will especially affect the price?

Mr. JONES. In the voluntary program they have tried to reduce from something just above 40,000,000 acres to around 25,000,000 acres this year, never intending at any time to surrender the foreign market, but simply to bring about an adjustment which is for the best interests of the

farmers in this country in selling their cotton. We hope to sell all we can abroad, and we hope to retain a market abroad, but we certainly do not want a continuation of the 4- or 5-cent cotton which we had at the time this program was started.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that something must be done to curtail the yield per year in this country?

Mr. JONES. At least for the time being, and then I hope the program can go along normally.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Under the voluntary plan that has been signed by a great many farmers, the Government pays a rental on the land taken out of the production of cotton.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Then there is a small number who have signed no contract. If they go ahead and comply and reduce their acreage, because of the penalty provided in the law, will they get any pay for their land taken out of production?

Mr. JONES. They will not unless they sign the voluntary contract.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Have they had a chance to sign it?

Mr. JONES. I am not sure, but after it was certain that this bill would pass, they had a chance to sign, and if they were not willing to cooperate to save the South from bankruptcy I have not much sympathy for them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY].

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I come from Mississippi, which State grows cotton. I have made some investigation in my section of the State, and have not been able to find anybody who has been asked to give his consent, as is alleged was done, for the proposal laid down in this Bankhead bill. There may be a few, but not many, I am sure.

Cotton is not only grown in the United States, but is grown in many parts of the world. Last year the world cotton crop was about 25,000,000 bales, of which 51 percent was grown in the United States, or a little over 12,500,000 bales.

Almost the same amount was grown in other parts of the world. Now, if we reduce our production to 10,000,000 bales and the other parts of the world only grow 12,500,000 bales, instead of 51 percent we will be growing 40 percent, and the rest of the world will be growing 60 percent. As a result we will lose the benefits of the sale of that portion of the cotton in the markets of the world, and it will not help the southern farmers in the proportion that they cut down their production. We will assist the foreign cotton raiser.

We will go to the market with three quarters of the crop and the rest of the world with a full crop and then some, because they will increase their production while we curtail ours. In 1884 we produced 4 out of 5 bales of cotton grown; under this bill we will produce 2 bales out of 5 bales of cotton grown in this year, 1935.

#### UNITED STATES TO WORLD COTTON MARKET

We are fixing to lose our market, and irretrievably we are surrendering to other parts of the world that which has been ours throughout generations of the past. You northwestern farmers, listen. We buy much of our feed and hay and corn from you. If you think that you are helping yourselves by playing a joke on the South in putting this thing upon the cotton farmers, we will turn around and produce our own feed, our own hay on vacant lands, our own cattle, our own butter, and we will cease to be your customers in time to come, just as we are losing the world market for cotton, you are losing the South as a market for your corn, feed, and hogs. It is a short-sighted policy we are

pursuing. We cannot lift ourselves by a processing tax. We cannot get out of this financial slump by climbing up on each other's shoulders. It will not work. Every time you lay a processing tax on a section of the country to support another section, you are taking part of the wages that the people in that section are earning, and you are lessening their buying power. What we are doing is not creating wealth. Trying to get out of this depression by climbing upon each other's shoulders, without increasing wealth a bit. You may increase prices for a time, but you cannot increase wealth except by production. You are not helping the South when you say that "we will put a processing tax in favor of the South and increase the cost of living to all, then we will levy a tariff in favor of the North and thereby increase living cost to all"; that we will do this thing for the hog raiser, and this thing for the wheat raiser, that we will get out of this thing by climbing upon each other's shoulders with high costs of living the only final result.

I am against this legislation because of another thing. It takes from the landowner the last vestige of control over his property. It takes the boys from the families that work the farms, from the families that labor to produce, unless they first get a ticket from the Secretary of Agriculture authorizing them to produce a limited number of bales of cotton.

It robs us of the fundamentals that we have cherished and relied on and boasted of as being the foundation stones of this great Government. I ask you to vote against this conference report. If you do not do it, in 3 years you will rue the day when you voted to approve this kind of legislation, seeking to escape through this means that which is inevitable. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, a planless agriculture in the presence of a planned industry would, in my judgment, condemn the South to a continuation of the conditions that have existed down there at intervals for many years. If the industry of the country were on a planless basis, if the automobile factories had been running full tilt during all of this depression, automobiles would be selling for \$100 apiece, and we could have afforded to have 5-cent cotton. But they have adjusted their production to their demands, and if we are going to live in the presence of that, we would better take similar steps ourselves, even though in working out a general program we may make a mistake or two. There are more than 10,000,000 bales of cotton in the carry-over. If nothing is done about it, it probably means 5- or 6-cent cotton again. Does anyone wish that? It is not a question of surrendering world markets. No one wishes to do that. If we produced no cotton at all this year we could still furnish the world with cotton to meet the demands. We are simply trying to adjust back to a normal basis. No one knows what the results of this bill will be. But for years other plans have failed. The farmers want to try it. If it does not work properly, it can be ended.

I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS). The question now recurs on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote because there is no quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 71, noes 45.

Mr. BUSBY. I object to the vote because there is no quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 105, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—235

Adair	Dobbins	Kniffin	Robertson
Adams	Dockweller	Kocialkowski	Robinson
Arens	Doughton	Kopplemann	Romjue
Arnold	Doxey	Kramer	Rudd
Ayers, Mont.	Drewry	Kvale	Ruffin
Ayres, Kans.	Driver	Lambeth	Sabath
Bankhead	Duffey	Lanham	Sanders
Beam	Duncan, Mo.	Lanzetta	Sandlin
Beiter	Dunn	Larrabee	Secrest
Berlin	Durgan, Ind.	Lee, Mo.	Shallenberger
Black	Eagle	Lehr	Shoemaker
Blanton	Edmiston	Lewis, Colo.	Sinclair
Bloom	Ellzey, Miss.	Lewis, Md.	Sirovich
Boehne	Faddis	Lindsay	Smith, Va.
Boileau	Farley	Lloyd	Smith, Wash.
Boland	Fernandez	Lozier	Smith, W. Va.
Boylan	Fitzgibbons	McCarthy	Snyder
Brown, Ga.	Fitzpatrick	McClintic	Somers, N.Y.
Brown, Ky.	Fletcher	McCormack	Spence
Brown, Mich.	Ford	McDuffie	Steagall
Brunner	Fuller	McFarlane	Strong, Tex.
Buchanan	Fulmer	McGrath	Stubbs
Bulwinkle	Gambrill	McKeown	Studley
Byrns	Gasque	McReynolds	Summers, Tex.
Cady	Gavagan	McSwain	Sutphin
Caldwell	Gilchrist	Maloney, Conn.	Swank
Carden, Ky.	Glover	Maloney, La.	Tarver
Carmichael	Goldsborough	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Cartwright	Granfield	Marland	Terry, Ark.
Castellow	Green	Martin, Colo.	Thom
Chavez	Greenwood	Martin, Oreg.	Thomason
Christianson	Gregory	May	Thompson, Tex.
Church	Haines	Mead	Thurston
Clark, N.C.	Hancock, N.C.	Meeks	Truax
Coffin	Harlan	Miller	Umstead
Colden	Hastings	Monaghan, Mont.	Utterback
Cole	Healey	Montet	Vinson, Ga.
Collins, Calif.	Henney	Murdock	Vinson, Ky.
Collins, Miss.	Hildebrandt	Musselwhite	Wallgren
Colmer	Hill, Ala.	Norton	Warren
Condon	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Connell	Wearin
Connery	Hoepfel	O'Connor	Weaver
Cooper, Tenn.	Holdale	O'Malley	Weideman
Cox	Howard	Oliver, Ala.	Welch
Cravens	Imhoff	Oliver, N.Y.	Werner
Crosby	Jacobsen	Owen	West, Ohio
Cross, Tex.	Jenckes, Ind.	Palmisano	West, Tex.
Crosser, Ohio	Johnson, Minn.	Parker	Whittington
Crowe	Johnson, Okla.	Parks	Willford
Crump	Johnson, Tex.	Parsons	Williams
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	Patman	Wilson
Cummings	Jones	Pierce	Withrow
Darden	Kee	Polk	Wood, Ga.
Dear	Keller	Prall	Wood, Mo.
Deen	Kennedy, Md.	Ramsay	Woodrum
Delaney	Kennedy	Ramspeck	Young
Dickinson	Kerr	Randolph	Zioncheck
Dickstein	Kleberg	Rayburn	The Speaker
Dies	Kloeb	Reilly	

NAYS—105

Andrews, N.Y.	Eaton	Lehlbach	Richardson
Bacharach	Edmonds	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Bakewell	Elcher	Luce	Schuetz
Biermann	Englebright	Ludlow	Schulte
Blanchard	Evans	Lundeen	Seger
Bland	Fish	McFadden	Snell
Brennan	Focht	McGugin	Swick
Brumm	Foss	McLean	Taylor, S.C.
Burke, Nebr.	Frear	McLeod	Taylor, Tenn.
Burnham	Goodwin	McMillan	Terrell, Tex.
Busby	Gray	Mapes	Thomas
Carpenter, Kans.	Griffin	Marshall	Tinkham
Carter, Calif.	Guyer	Merritt	Tobey
Carter, Wyo.	Hancock, N.Y.	Millard	Traeger
Chase	Hess	Mitchell	Treadway
Clarke, N.Y.	Higgins	Moran	Turner
Cochran, Mo.	Holmes	Morehead	Turpin
Cochran, Pa.	Hope	Mott	Walter
Connolly	Huddleston	Moynihan, Ill.	Whitley
Cooper, Ohio	Jenkins, Ohio	O'Brien	Wigglesworth
Culkin	Kahn	Perkins	Wolcott
De Priest	Kelly, Ill.	Peyser	Wolfenden
Dirksen	Kelly, Pa.	Powers	Wolverton
Disney	Kennedy, N.Y.	Rankin	Woodruff
Ditter	Kinzer	Ransley	
Dondero	Knutson	Reed, N.Y.	
Dowell	Lambertson	Rich	

NOT VOTING—91

Abernethy	Bailey	Browning	Cannon, Wis.
Allen	Beck	Buck	Carley, N.Y.
Allgood	Beedy	Buckbee	Carpenter, Neb.
Andrew, Mass.	Bolton	Burch	Cary
Auf der Heide	Britten	Burke, Calif.	Cavichia
Bacon	Brooks	Cannon, Mo.	Celler



Chapman	Gillette	Martin, Mass.	Sears
Claborn	Goss	Milligan	Shannon
Corning	Greenway	Montague	Simpson
Crowther	Griswold	Muldowney	Sisson
Darrow	Hamilton	Nesbit	Stalker
DeRouen	Hart	Peavey	Stokes
Dingell	Harter	Peterson	Strong, Pa.
Douglass	Hartley	Pettengill	Sullivan
Doutrich	Hill, Knute	Plumley	Sweeney
Ellenbogen	Hollister	Reece	Taber
Elts, Calif.	Hughes	Reid, Ill.	Thompson, Ill.
Fiesinger	James	Richards	Underwood
Flannagan	Jeffers	Rogers, N.H.	Wadsworth
Foulkes	Kurtz	Rogers, Okla.	Waldron
Frey	Lamneck	Sadowski	White
Gifford	Lea, Calif.	Schaefer	Wilcox
Gillespie	Lesinski	Scrugham	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Allgood (for) with Mr. Taber (against).  
 Mr. Jeffers (for) with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts (against).  
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Bolton (against).  
 Mr. Browning (for) with Mr. Hollister (against).  
 Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania (against).  
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin (for) with Mr. Bacon (against).  
 Mrs. Greenway (for) with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts (against).  
 Mr. Carley (for) with Mr. Kurtz (against).  
 Mr. Peterson (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).  
 Mr. Richards (for) with Mr. Doutrich (against).  
 Mr. Burch (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).  
 Mr. Fiesinger (for) with Mr. Gifford (against).  
 Mr. Ellenbogen (for) with Mr. Corning (against).  
 Mr. Bailey (for) with Mr. Caviechia (against).  
 Mr. Lea of California (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).  
 Mr. Sears (for) with Mr. Hartley (against).  
 Mr. Sisson (for) with Mr. Muldowney (against).  
 Mr. DeRouen (for) with Mr. Plumley (against).  
 Mr. Cannon of Missouri (for) with Mr. Elts of California (against).  
 Mr. Douglass (for) with Mr. Britten (against).  
 Mr. Chapman (for) with Mr. Beedy (against).  
 Mr. Knute Hill (for) with Mr. Beck (against).  
 Mr. Griswold (for) with Mr. Goss (against).  
 Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire (for) with Mr. Buck (against).  
 Mr. Cary (for) with Mr. James (against).  
 Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma (for) with Mr. Stokes (against).  
 Mr. Sweeney (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).  
 Mr. Burke of California (for) with Mr. Stalker (against).  
 Mr. Scrugham (for) with Mr. Pettengill (against).  
 Mr. Thompson of Illinois (for) with Mr. Reece (against).  
 Mr. Carpenter of Nebraska (for) with Mr. Peavey (against).  
 Mr. Hughes (for) with Mr. Gillette (against).  
 Mr. Dingell (for) with Mr. Harter (against).  
 Mr. Schaefer (for) with Mr. Simpson (against).  
 Mr. White (for) with Mr. Nesbit (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Allen.  
 Mr. Gillespie with Mr. Buckbee.  
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Auf der Heide.  
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Brooks.  
 Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Claborn.  
 Mr. Shannon with Mr. Frey.  
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Foulkes.  
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Hamilton.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. RAINEY, and he voted "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. JONES, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague on Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. ROGERS, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HARTER, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JAMES, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Goss, and the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. PLUMLEY, are detained in connection with work on the subcommittee and are therefore unable to vote.

#### EQUALIZATION OF TAXATION

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7835) to provide relief, to equalize taxation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The

Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. DOUGHTON, SAMUEL B. HILL, CULLEN, TREADWAY, and BACHARACH.

JOHN J. BLAINE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce that John J. Blaine, recent Senator from the State of Wisconsin, died yesterday. He was a man well and popularly known throughout my State for a quarter of a century, from the days when he was State senator. Subsequently he served as attorney general, as Governor of the State for three terms, and as United States Senator. At the time of his death he was a director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of this Government.

Mr. Blaine was an outstanding official, known to the whole people of my State for his undoubted courage and ability. On behalf of my colleagues I express the sympathy we all feel for his family and host of friends in their bereavement.

As I was about to make this announcement I received a telegram stating that Justice Walter Owen, of the supreme court, one of my closest friends, also a former State senator and attorney general of the State, died yesterday at the same time with Mr. Blaine in Wisconsin. Thus the State of Wisconsin has lost two distinguished men who were highly honored by its people. Again we express our sympathy in this double loss to our State.

#### DISASTER PREPAREDNESS

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BOEHNE], delivered at the Red Cross Convention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. JOHN W. BOEHNE, Jr., member of the board of directors of the Evansville Chapter, American Red Cross, before the round-table conference of the American Red Cross held in Washington, D.C., April 9, 1934:

The Evansville (Ind.) Chapter of the American Red Cross feels highly honored that it has been requested to present to this round-table conference its complete set-up on disaster preparedness. We feel quite proud of the work that our special disaster preparedness committee has done, and I hope that the information which I will give to you will be of benefit to similar committees throughout the Nation. Evansville has been very fortunate in that very few major disasters have been visited upon it, but, of course, we never know when lightning will strike. For that reason we insist that this committee be in readiness at all times, and that its membership know exactly what is to be expected of it at the moment it is called upon to serve.

This disaster preparedness committee was formed in September 1930, at which time a group of the busiest business men of Evansville came together and selected the entire committee and named the various subcommittees.

Good propaganda, of course, is always worth while. Each year we have what we now know as an annual disaster preparedness day. On this day the entire committee meets and studies a typical type of disaster problem, so that each committee member may refresh in his mind the duties that are his. This meeting is always held in October, just prior to the annual drive. This in itself is excellent publicity for the drive. The mayor of the city proclaims that day as annual disaster preparedness day, and naturally the local newspapers carry stories about the work of the committee. Fortunately one of the local newspapers employs a very clever cartoonist, who is tremendously interested in the city, and he always displays a very appropriate cartoon on this subject. In addition to this, all the schools in the city take part in that the various school classes, particularly the upper grammar grades and the high-school grades, prepare essays on what each child would feel to be his duty in the event of a major disaster.

We also enlist the aid of the Boy Scouts, who are very active in our city.

We find that our standing disaster preparedness committee is one of our biggest selling points to the public. The night of this preparedness day the entire committee, composed of approximately

20 members, meets at one of our country clubs for a dinner and a program.

For several years after we formed our committee we always were able to secure a speaker of national importance from headquarters at Washington. We have now graduated to the point where we feel it is time to provide our own program.

For our last meeting we had Mr. Maurice Reddy send us a typical disaster problem, which was somewhat like the Knickerbocker disaster of a few years ago. We have quite a large Coliseum in Evansville, and the disaster problem covered the work that would be necessary upon the complete collapse of that building while it was fully occupied. Copies of this program were sent to all the disaster committee members at least 10 days in advance of the meeting, and the various subcommittee chairmen were asked to meet with their own subcommittees and be prepared to tell exactly what part they should play. This particular meeting was the best that the committee has ever had.

To show you how thoroughly the job was done, I want to give you some of the details that were worked out by the subcommittee chairmen with their subcommittees. The chairman of the clothing subcommittee, for instance, knew exactly how many blankets he should secure and where he could secure them. The chairman of the shelter subcommittee had made a complete survey of the downtown section and knew where every empty building was located, and the capacity of every such building. The chairman of the food subcommittee had in advance wired the Indiana State National Guard at Indianapolis and had found out how many rolling kitchens were available on very short notice and how they could be secured. The chairman of medical aid had called every hospital and had a definite doctor scheduled to go to the scene of the disaster and other doctors ordered to remain at the hospitals to receive injured patients. In addition to this, he had made arrangements for several large buildings in the vicinity of the Coliseum, where first-aid stations were to be erected. He had secured the exact floor space of these buildings and came prepared to tell the committee the exact capacity of each building—how many patients each building would house.

It was really one of the most inspiring meetings the disaster preparedness committee has ever had. The interest manifested by those busy business men was astonishing. At the conclusion it was unanimously decided that this should be repeated not annually but at least semiannually. In order that nothing should be overlooked, our very efficient secretary, Miss Mary Bailey, through her office staff called on the chairman of each subcommittee, who in turn was asked to check up on his subcommittee to see if there were any vacancies due to death or removal from the city. Should such vacancies occur, the subcommittee chairmen have the authority to fill such vacancies immediately. Aside from this, a complete and accurate list of the entire disaster preparedness committee, with the names of the various subcommittee chairmen, and his subcommittees, with home addresses and telephone numbers, is on file at each one of the telegraph offices, as well as with the Indiana Bell Telephone Co.

Naturally, it is quite important to be sure of the men who are to serve as subcommittee chairmen. We have been especially interested in seeing to it that only those men whose particular line of work would dovetail with their proposed work in a major disaster would be selected. For instance, the chairman of the subcommittee on clothing is Mr. R. C. Smith, who is the head of our largest department store. Likewise his committee members are chosen from that field. The chairman of the subcommittee on food is Mr. Clarence Kahn, who is manager of our largest wholesale produce house.

The chairman of the subcommittee on medical aid is Dr. W. W. Hewins, one of Evansville's ablest physicians and surgeons. The chairman of the subcommittee on purchasing is Mr. H. A. Woods, a very prominent merchant and active head of a chain of drug stores. The chairman of the subcommittee on shelter is Mr. Henry Schroeder, manager of the Sunbeam Electric Manufacturing Co., and whose committee has made a very careful survey of the housing facilities of the city. His committee members represent lumber companies, as well as awning and tent supplies. Our chairman of the subcommittee on intelligence is Mr. A. A. Brantano, active manager of a very large printing establishment. Our chairman of finance is a leading banker of Evansville, Mr. Frank R. Wilson, vice president of the Old National Bank. Our chairman on the subcommittee of transportation and communication is Mr. Henry Koch, who is the head of several large companies and has a fleet of trucks at his command.

Evansville is fortunate in having a radio station—WGBF. The manager of that station, Mr. Clarence Leich, is very much interested in our work, and has of his own accord set up a short-wave radio set operating independently of city current and placed at the transmitter of WGBF, 8 miles north of Evansville on Highway No. 41. This has been done so that information could be sent out in the event a disaster would wreck the local radio station. The call letters of this short-wave set are W9AIN and it is constantly in readiness to operate day and night.

We do not consider our set-up perfect at all. We feel though that we have gotten a good start. We attribute the present standing of our disaster preparedness committee largely to the fact that the committee itself meets frequently and every member of it is reminded of his duties and responsibilities at the time

of a disaster, which, of course, everyone hopes will never occur. We hope that what little we have done will be of benefit to the American Red Cross.

#### CONSERVATION AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an excellent address delivered over the radio by the Speaker of this House on the subject of citizenship and conservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid address of Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY, Speaker of the House of Representatives, over the National Broadcasting Co. network on Sunday, April 8, 1934:

#### CONSERVATION AND CITIZENSHIP

Twenty-five years ago, when the first Roosevelt was President of the United States, we commenced, under his leadership, to realize the importance of conservation. We commenced to realize then, rather dimly, that it required millions of years to prepare the world for the habitation of men.

For millions of years the earth revolved on its axis and completed its yearly journeys around the sun while vegetation flourished and grew and died; while great forests spread over the earth, attained their maturity and died; and other growths of vegetation and other forests grew on the remains of the dead vegetation and in turn perished and died. In this way our great coal fields developed and our deposits of oil were made. All this was essential in order to prepare the world for the sustenance of animal life, and after millions of years the process of the creation of the world had developed to such an extent that it was possible for animal life to appear, and finally the world was made fit for the habitation of man. Its vast stores of coal, iron ore, gold, silver, and oil had developed and decaying vegetation had resulted in rich, black fertile soil, capable of producing the cereals necessary to maintain men and animals. The land had appeared; the waters had receded; rivers pursued their courses down from the mountains to the sea; abundant life was possible.

An all-wise Creator turned all this valuable heritage over to the race of men He created; and we commenced to waste and destroy it. The period of the world's history marked by the presence of men on the earth is inconsiderable in length as compared to the millions of years required to make the world a safe habitation for men and animals. We proceeded then rapidly to destroy the heritage which has been prepared for us. Forests commenced to disappear and deserts took their places. Great civilizations developed and flourished and, with the destruction of natural resources, faded from the earth.

It is only in recent years that we have commenced to realize that what remains of the natural resources prepared for us must be preserved, and not destroyed. At the present time our coal fields are being rapidly depleted. Thousands of oil wells, three times as many as are needed, have been sunk, and salt water has been permitted to permeate the pools of oil. Overproduction has been rapidly at work in recent years destroying this valuable heritage.

They realized in Germany long before we did the necessity of preserving their national resources. It is impossible in Germany, and has been for many years, to cut down a tree on your own land without permission from the proper conservation official of the Government. When trees are cut, provision must be made for replanting. In a recent trip through Germany I was impressed with their magnificent forests. Germany has all the timber she needs for all purposes, but trees are cut scientifically and replanting is done as directed by the Government.

From Berlin I traveled through northern Poland. The country was bare and desolate of trees. During the World War this part of Poland was occupied by Germany. When it became necessary for her military commanders to build in northern France during the World War the longest line of defenses ever constructed on the face of the earth—the Hindenburg line—she was able to accomplish it without impoverishing her forests. The Hindenburg line was largely built of trees, and the trees were obtained, not from her own magnificent forests, but from the forests of northern Poland, and carried on railroads five or six hundred miles through Poland and Germany and into northern France. She lost millions of men in battle; but her natural resources were not disturbed; they were preserved for future generations of Germans, and her forests will stand.

Recently the ruins of a magnificent city were discovered in a remote part of the Desert of Sahara, indicating that where this great desert now exists there were once vast fertility and forests and rivers. The civilization indicated by these ruins could have existed under no other environment, and this civilization grew and developed and perished from the earth long before the period of recorded history. But the ruins recently discovered are evidence of the fact that reckless use of natural resources eventually de-



stroyed the soil which made possible the production of life-sustaining crops and which made possible the existence of animal life. With the destruction of vegetation and soil the rivers which must have existed disappeared and a vast expanse of sand took the place of what were at a remote period fertile lands capable of sustaining cities and perhaps a large population outside of the cities.

Recently, aviators discovered, 1,000 miles from Jerusalem, the remains of an ancient city with its palaces, its towers, and its extensive burial grounds. It was, they say, the capital city of the vast, fertile, rich empire of the Queen of Sheba, but evidently a disregard of the fundamentals of conservation as the centuries passed destroyed the civilization which once existed there, and the population there now consists, the aviators tell us, of a few wandering tribes of warlike Arabs who guard with superstitious reverence what remains of the ruins of the ancient capital city of the Queen of Sheba.

A bill will come up in Congress next week intended to preserve what remains of vegetation on our national domain. We are told in the hearings that owners of great flocks of sheep insist upon driving flocks, thousands of them in every flock, onto the public domain where the already sparse vegetation is being destroyed. The sheep eat the grass, roots and all, and vast sections of the public domain are being converted into a desert. A vigorous fight will be made, we are advised, by the owners of these great herds to insist upon the privileges they have heretofore enjoyed, and those privileges involve the destruction of the vegetation on millions of acres of land, and possibly the creation of another great waterless desert in the western section of the United States. They insist upon the continuance indefinitely of the privileges they now enjoy, which involve the inevitable destruction of plant life in all that section.

As vegetation is destroyed, rainfall stops, rivers and streams disappear, wild life vanishes, and a desert is created. Something like this must have happened to the civilizations which preceded recorded history of which there remains only the mute evidence of ruined cities.

Forests at the headwaters of our rivers are at the present time rapidly disappearing; and with the disappearance of forest growth, floods held back by trees and vegetation are no longer retarded and rivers quickly become raging torrents as they plunge on down to the sea. Rainfall decreases on the areas which were formerly covered by forests and that part of the world in which we live is now too rapidly deteriorating as our population increases, and we are commencing to realize that conservation must be more vigorously promoted than in past years.

I am thoroughly in sympathy with the efforts of the Educational Conservation Society. The place to commence a program of conservation is in the schools. Those who are to come after we are gone must be educated now as to the importance of the preservation of trees, of grasslands, of coal, of oil, and of wild life. All of us who are now living can live out our lives perhaps without serious inconvenience, but it is an obligation which we must realize to preserve natural resources for generations yet unborn.

Only God can make a tree; it takes a hundred years of time to do it. A few years ago in a western forest a giant redwood tree crashed. The Bureau of Forestry sawed through the tree and studied the rings which indicated its annual growth and issued a little bulletin, *The Story of a Tree*. By the study of the growth rings they found the tree was standing and was a monarch of the forest when Christ lived on the earth. Biblical stories of droughts were verified by decreased tree growth during those particular periods described in Biblical history. This bulletin ought to be reprinted and circulated in schools to stimulate an interest in tree life.

It takes a small forest of trees to produce one edition of a great metropolitan Sunday newspaper, with all its supplements, and small trees are rapidly being destroyed and converted into pulpwood in order to produce the vast amount of paper used in the Sunday editions of these great newspapers. A substitute can be found for pulpwood and we are gradually promoting the business of the manufacture of paper out of corn stalks and out of straw. This industry ought to be encouraged and, if necessary, subsidized by legislative action.

We recently appointed a House committee to study this summer the matter of the preservation of wild life, and the summer months will be consumed by this committee in its studies—how to preserve bird life; how to preserve the lives of migratory waterfowl from the ruthless slaughter in progress now.

A sentiment is rapidly developing which will lend itself in a short time to the taking over by the National Government of the great area of swamp lands in southern Florida in order to preserve the abundant bird life which exists there now. We have already established along our rivers some national preserves and we expect to establish still more game preserves in the immediate future.

Organizations, such as the Educational Conservation Society, are engaged in promoting propositions of this character.

At the present time songbirds are rapidly disappearing. Not many years ago there were always a song somewhere; there came always the song of the lark when the skies were clear; and then, when the skies were gray, there was always the song of the thrush. Not long ago the bluebird sang its song from orchard trees and whether the skies were dark or were clear there always came, just

a few years ago, from orchards and from the forests and along the hedgerows the love songs of wild birds. These conditions we know are rapidly disappearing.

In some sections of the southern part of the United States robins are killed as game birds. They do not sing in the South; but when they come back to our colder North, they sing their love songs. But there is a perceptible diminution in this form of bird wild life in the course of the last 20 years.

The great destruction of wild life, of forests, and of oil has all occurred within the last 40 years and is proceeding more rapidly now than ever. The depletion of our mineral resources must be stopped. We need more land laws to preserve our remaining public domain from the waste and the looting of private interests.

We have started in now to develop water power by Government agencies at Muscle Shoals and at Boulder Dam, and these are features of the broader national program for the conservation of natural resources.

We are controlling forest fires better now than we did 30 years ago, but there is much along these lines to be done. There is still a tremendous waste through soil erosion. Our armies of unemployed in the last 12 months have been engaged in stopping some of it, and their work will be educational and will inspire men to preserve against erosion the farms which are now in cultivation.

We must preserve for future generations all those things adapted to the physical well-being and the comfort and the happiness of the people who will live on this earth and within the boundaries of the continental United States long after we are gone.

#### AMATEUR BOXING

Mrs. NORTON presented the following conference report on the bill (S. 828) to authorize boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was ordered printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES GEOGRAPHIC BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 16 of the act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 212, 47 Stat. 1517), as amended by title III of the act of March 20, 1933 (ch. 3, 48 Stat. 16), I am transmitting herewith an Executive order abolishing the United States Geographic Board and transferring its functions to the Department of the Interior.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 17, 1934.

#### VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered spread upon the Journal:

#### To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 8046, entitled "An act to provide a penalty for the knowing or willful presentation of any false written instrument relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the Government with intent to defraud the United States."

This bill, in effect, seeks to punish every person who, with intent to defraud the United States, knowingly or willfully makes, aids, or assists in the making of any false representation concerning any matter within the jurisdiction of any agency of the United States, or any corporation owned or controlled by the United States. The maximum penalty prescribed by the bill is a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years, or both.

These offenses are already covered by existing law, which provides for more severe punishment than that proposed by the bill. Section 35 of the Criminal Code, as amended by the act of October 23, 1918 (U.S.C., title 18, sec. 80), in addition to covering certain other offenses, provides for the punishment of all persons who, for the purpose and with the intent of cheating and swindling or defrauding the Government of the United States, or any department thereof, or any corporation in which the United States is a stockholder, knowingly and willfully falsify, or conceal or cover up, a material fact, or make or cause to be made any false or fraudulent statement or representation. The penalty prescribed by the foregoing section is a fine of not more than

\$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, to wit, double the penalty prescribed in the bill under consideration.

The bill is objectionable in that its result would be to reduce the punishment for certain frauds against the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 17, 1934.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President and the bill be referred to the Judiciary Committee and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1935

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9061), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 9061, the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1935, with Mr. SEARS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity merely to make a few brief observations and possibly an analysis of the testimony in the investigation of Dr. Wirt; and I want to emphasize to my Democratic friends that Dr. Wirt is not our baby. [Laughter.] Not only do I want to emphasize to my Democratic friends that he is not our baby, but that we have no relation whatever to him; they cannot prove any evidence of paternity on the part of the Republican Party. [Applause.] We have never sponsored him and we do not propose to let the Democrats place him upon our doorstep. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. BYRNS. Is the gentleman making this statement as an apology for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN]?

Mr. FISH. No; the gentleman from Kansas can speak for himself; he generally does; and he knows how to speak for himself very ably.

I am making this statement not only for the education of the Democratic Party but for accuracy of statements in the press.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I am sorry but I cannot yield. I must catch a 4:05 train.

That is exactly why I rose to speak, because what the Democrats are trying to do is perfectly obvious; they are trying to make this so-called "doctor" from Indiana a Republican agent, a Republican propagandist. [Laughter.] Now let us get down to the facts.

As Al Smith said, "Let us look at the record." Let us see what the record proves.

In the first place, the testimony that was submitted on behalf of Dr. Wirt was introduced before a committee of this House by the head of the committee on the Nation, a committee that has for its object the depreciation of the currency, certainly not a Republican principle, an organization that had backed the President 100 percent up to that time. Dr. Wirt, if he was spokesman for anyone, was the spokesman for that committee, and it was the president of this committee who had been supporting the President all the way through that read his testimony into the RECORD. When the charge was read into the RECORD a Democratic

member of the committee, not a Republican, introduced a resolution to have him investigated, and the House, controlled by the Democrats, appointed a committee to investigate, and naturally they put in charge members of their own party.

Facts are facts, and they are very stubborn things. I knew very well when I started to speak that you Democrats would like to wish Dr. Wirt on us as one of our main propagandists, when, as a matter of fact, he was spokesman for a committee that was back of the administration and trying to depreciate the currency. Even the testimony of the witnesses given before the committee today states that Dr. Wirt took up all of the time at the dinner talking about depreciating the currency. I want to be fair, and I believe this should be nonpartisan. It is evidently hard to make it nonpartisan. I heard the testimony the first day, and, as far as I am concerned, I did not hear any testimony from Dr. Wirt about his so-called "dinner with a nest of radicals" that would hold any weight in court. He just recited what he thought he heard in talking to a bunch of radicals. One was a Communist. Another was a Socialist. They were all subordinates. What did it amount to?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will yield him a half minute.

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. This is the first time I ever saw the gentleman from New York afraid to yield.

Mr. FISH. I will answer any question of the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield the gentleman a half minute to answer the question.

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. If Dr. Wirt is not the gentleman's baby, then why is he and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN] acting as wet nurses for him? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FISH. That is a fair question in some respects. I have never met Dr. Wirt. I have never spoken on this floor about Dr. Wirt, and I know nothing whatever about him. As far as that dinner is concerned, I do not think his testimony amounts to anything. If the gentleman refers to other Members of the House, perhaps he has a right to, but as far as I am concerned the gentleman never heard me mention Dr. Wirt in this House.

First I want to say that I do not think the testimony Dr. Wirt presented about the dinner conversation amounted to anything, and, second, Dr. Wirt has no connection whatever with the Republican Party. As I said before, he is not our baby, and even the gentleman from Texas is not going to bring him along and put him on our doorstep. As far as his trying to prove that we were in the midst of an economic and social revolution, the only thing he was trying to prove was about the easiest thing to prove to anyone's satisfaction. There are any number of Members of this House that can prove it. The only way to prove it is by the testimony of the members of the "brain trust" themselves.

Look at the books they have written. Look at their speeches. Look at their other acts. I am just a pacifist on this question. I am mild compared with some Members of the House on the Democratic side. I have heard Democratic Members get up and denounce the A.A.A. and call the members of the A.A.A. Communists and all kinds of things. I do not agree with their sentiments, because lots of times I think people confuse socialism with communism. I do not know of any Communist in this administration, but I know of a great many Socialists. I know a number of Socialist-minded men, and I know these men, holding key positions in this administration, are out of sympathy with our economic and political system. They are disbelievers in our present system and they want to bring about a social and economic revolution. That is exactly what they are trying to do, and they are largely succeeding at the present time. There are a number of Democrats here that know that. There are a number of Democrats, a majority in this House, who are not in sympathy with that idea, and are not



in sympathy with the "brain trust", and are not in sympathy with their socialistic ideas.

This is what Dr. Wirt was trying to prove, but he knows less about it than do half the Members of the House who live here in Washington. We know these people and we see what they are doing every day. Dr. Wirt merely comes here occasionally from the State of Indiana and attends a little dinner.

I heard only the first day's testimony, but there are only two remarks that should be investigated, because they did seriously challenge the Government and challenged two high officials in the Government service. One was Frederic Howe. Dr. Wirt testified that General Westervelt had said that Frederic Howe had come to him and said, in effect, "We won't be able to give any more money to the unemployed and hungry so we can accomplish our results sooner." Dr. Tugwell said, "We ought to take the young students and put them together and educate them along these radical ideas so we can use them." These men, General Westervelt, Dr. Tugwell, and Dr. Howe, should be called before the committee instead of calling a few of these subordinates who do not amount to anything and which results in nothing. Those were serious charges, and they are the only charges that have not been investigated. The only thing that Dr. Wirt said that was worth while at all has been utterly ignored. Everybody knows that and everybody knows, if they want to take the trouble to investigate the record of either Dr. Howe or Dr. Tugwell, that both of them have been associated for years with socialistic organizations; not 1 but 3 or 4 of them. I can name every one of these organizations. You can go into the records and find what they themselves have stated. You do not have to have a man come down here from Indiana to tell us what public statements these men made or what they said in their writings. We can fill books with the socialistic statements of Dr. Howe and Dr. Tugwell.

We can show exactly what they are trying to do, and I do not believe they would deny it. They are trying to destroy the profit system, and the profit system is nothing but the American industrial system, that whether you are a laborer, a farmer, or whatnot, you are entitled to make a reasonable profit. Their whole idea and the whole idea of every organization they belong to is to destroy this profit system.

The only reason I rose to speak today, and I admit I had some ulterior motives, is that I hoped I would have time to discuss the air mail and some other little problems before us, but, unfortunately for you and for me, I have not the time to do this. I do want to say, however, although I think I have made it perfectly clear in spite of the gentleman from Texas, this is the first time I have spoken on Dr. Wirt or his testimony or what he is trying to do; but his objective, which is perfectly clear, is to call the attention of the people back home to the fact that we are in the midst of a social and economic revolution, and the only testimony he produced is that of General Westervelt.

So I challenge the committee, before they conclude their hearings, to call General Westervelt before them and ask him whether it is the truth that he made these two statements, and then call Dr. Tugwell and Dr. Howe and ask them if they belong to these socialistic organizations, and ask them if these statements printed under their names are the truth—whether they desire to destroy the profit system. This will end the whole thing, and if they deny it or if they deny their own work, then, again, that is the end of the whole proposition.

Mr. BLACK. What is the use of spending the money; we can take your word for it.

Mr. FISH. I think you are right, and you can take their word for it, too, because it is printed in black and white, and there is no use spending any more money.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman say he wanted to catch the 4:05 New York train for that most important banquet tonight?

Mr. FISH. Yes; and the gentleman took a minute out of my time. In conclusion, I challenge the Democratic members of the committee, if they want to do the honest thing and the right thing, to call these two gentlemen and ask for their own testimony to find out whether they are Socialists or not. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to announce in the time I have the death of a constituent, Mrs. Belle Rhynes, of Savannah, Ga., who died last Sunday.

In my opinion, Mrs. Rhynes was the oldest citizen in the United States. She had reached the age of 123 years on last March 4, and I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a short newspaper account of her death, telling some of the incidents in her life.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CALDWELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

#### 123-YEAR-OLD WOMAN DIES AT HOME IN SAVANNAH

SAVANNAH, Ga., April 15.—Mrs. Belle Rhynes, 123-year-old Irish woman, who attributed her long life to pipe smoking and a philosophical outlook, died today at the Little Sisters of the Poor Home.

She was born in Dublin, March 4, 1811, and came to America with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Heights, when 11 years old. In early life she joined a circus with her husband, now many years dead, and performed as a snake charmer and dancer.

It was a matter of pride and principle with Mrs. Rhynes that she always took the things of life as they came. She had smoked a pipe for 112 years, she said, and it was to this, coupled with her philosophical outlook on life, that she laid her longevity.

On her one hundred and twenty-first birthday, when feebleness began to manifest itself strongly, Mrs. Rhynes said: "I'm as happy as a little pig in the sunshine, and they talk about me being old. Why, Uncle John Shell was 130, and he started out to get some wood to cook with when he fell dead in the yard." Shell was a one-time neighbor.

She was confirmed by the Most Rev. Michael J. Keyes, Catholic bishop of Savannah, on her one hundred and twentieth birthday, and on that occasion received quantities of presents from her friends—including a pipe, rosaries, flowers, tobacco, candy, and bedroom slippers were given her that time.

Last year Mrs. Rhynes took a marked interest in the political situation when Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated President on her birthday. She had just recovered from an illness when she learned of the inauguration, and breakfasted in bed, topping things off by smoking her pipe. She never tried cigarettes. She said she had asthma for 101 years, but had been cured of that.

Tomorrow at 9 a.m. she will be buried in the Catholic cemetery. She has one living relative in America, a great-grandson, Joe McBee, of Louisville, Ky.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I want to take 5 minutes of your time to devote to this so-called "Wirt or Squirt investigation." The gentleman from New York today has disclaimed any ownership of this baby that he claims we are trying to lay on your doorstep. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the gentleman who first read into the RECORD the reported statements of Dr. Wirt and demanded here an investigation is the gentleman from the western State of Kansas [Mr. MCGUGIN] who charged here that we were formulating a Communist plot for the overthrow of our Government.

I have attended every meeting of the special committee and I have seen the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MCGUGIN] as he has attempted to prove Dr. Wirt a national hero and attempted to uncover some sort of sinister rebellion, and as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has confessed today, the whole thing is a flop, and now that it has flopped they want to bring Wirt back over here and put him on our doorstep. Well, we do not want him. He is the child of the gentleman from Kansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman, Dr. Wirt, at the first hearing expressed great reluctance about all this publicity he was given. He was anxious to get back to Indiana. We asked him if he would be available at the next hearing and he stayed over until the next day. He has since been in Washington although he was paid off by the Sergeant at Arms some \$90, which was at the rate of over \$1 a minute, and which some people thought was excessive compensation. However, he is still in Washington, available to any newspapermen or any photographers although the committee has said that they are through and have no need for any more of his testimony, but with the \$90 in his pocket, payment at the rate of \$1 a minute, he is just itching for another chance to expound his obsessions before the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. The gentleman's remarks are quite true.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. If it is a short one; yes.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman recall that before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, when Mr. Rand offered this testimony, JOHN COOPER, a Republican, objected, but Mr. BULWINKLE wanted it to go in the Record?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I do not recall that, because I was not present; but I will say that I was present when you got your finished product up here. When your delivery doctor, Mr. McGUGIN, announced the probable arrival of this baby, Dr. Wirt, your side of the House cheered gleefully, or so it is recorded in the Record; but now that the baby turns out to have the scurvy and apparently not capable of making much political ballyhoo, you now bring in Dr. FISH and try to prove that the child is not yours. Well, if he is not yours, why has the gentleman from Kansas taken so much time to defend him? Why has he launched such bitter attacks on the "brain trust" under the guise of speaking on the Wirt investigation?

When Dr. Wirt was called into the room, I was present. I heard every word he said. I heard two Republican members of the committee attempt to make the audience believe that he was deprived of the opportunity of counsel.

Whoever heard of a witness in a courtroom having an attorney to tell him what to say, and yet the Republican members tried to make the audience believe that; and this morning they brought in a gallery or a group to applaud Mr. McGUGIN in every remark that he made.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman realize that the newspapermen made an investigation of this gallery, or clique, that applauded Dr. Wirt and his counsel, Mr. McGugin, and they found that they were Republican officeholders who had been discharged since the Democrats took over the administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I will say that if this gallery was constituted of Republican ex-officeholders, I am sorry that there were not more of them there. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Who pays them?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I have no doubt their pay will come from some source that otherwise might have been turned to the Republican Party.

Now, there has been a lot said about the "brain trust." It would have been a good thing in this country if there had been brains in the Government before this administration got in. [Applause.]

You had the trust all right, no question about that; but this is the first illustration of brains in government.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman realizes that there are a great many people in this country who know that this is a controversy between the Steel Trust and the "brain trust."

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. No question about that. Why, the man they send in to proclaim the "brain trust" plot was for the steel industry. If this is a contest between the

"brain trusters" and the "steel trusters", I am for the "brain trusters" every time. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the gentleman spell that word "steel"?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. You can spell it either way, and it works just the same. In this country they have been stealing what should have gone to the masses of the people, until today millions, except for the Government, would be starving.

Now, as to Dr. Wirt, I ask which one of you would be guilty of going to a private home, accepting the hospitality of the owner, enunciating your own doctrine, and then deliberately lie to serve your masters back home? Dr. Wirt accepted the hospitality of this lady, took dinner there, monopolized the conversation, and then attempts to use the occasion for political propaganda purposes solely to bring in the political philosophy of a member of the "brain trust." He has written several booklets on the subject and otherwise commercialized the friendship and hospitality of his friends. To what depths of depravity has this man sunk that he will exploit his friend of 20 years for publicity for himself and to make ammunition for the interests that he seeks to serve? What section of our people has been harmed by the "brain trust"? Farm prices are up, labor gets better wages and shorter hours, retail business is better, the hungry are fed, millions have been given jobs. What is it about the "brain trust" to which the gentlemen object?

There is one clash here—and there is only one clash—and that is between the old order of merciless exploitation of the many to fatten the few and the new order which believes that prosperity belongs to all of the people. I heard Dr. Wirt say, when they put the question to him, "What is it that the brain-trusters seem to want?" He said, "They kept talking about a richer life." Gentlemen, if you go back home you will find that the people of this country want a part of that richer life. I do not see anything wrong in that. This morning I heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] ask further, What is it you would do? The lady on the stand said, "I think I would give some of the benefits of life to the rest of the people in this country." Is there anything wrong with that? You cry out for the old order. What part of it do you want? They just want you to pass around some of these benefits to the people who are hungry. It means taking the huge dividends and letting the people have a break on them. It means that labor must live and that the consumers must be considered. You talk about regimentation. I heard them cry regimentation and planned economy, and for 50 years you have had regimentation, but you have regimented the people of this country for a few big industries. The steel trust has had everything regimented for it. Your big industries have had things regimented for them, but when you start giving some of the benefits to the people of this country, you bring in Mr. FISH, with his report on communism and cry out that this thing is radical.

I do not think we ought to have waited for the gentleman from New York to come and defend the administration or for him to make the statement that the "brain trusters" are not communistic. If it is communism to give the people a break, then I am for communism; and if it is socialism to give them a break, I am for that. If it is "brain trusting" to call for a social order that gives a break to classes that have been robbed for years, I am for that; and I am not going to be scared off by their dragging Dr. Wirt across the path and saying that we are plotting revolution.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said that there were a great many Democrats and a great many people in the administration who are out of sympathy with the economic order that we have. I want to be put down as one out of sympathy with any economic order which has starved millions for the last 8 or 10 years.



Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I think that is generally the spirit. The people back home are not going to be misled by a red herring being dragged across the path, and I am glad to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] recognizes today that the Wirt episode is a bust and refuses to accept responsibility for it. [Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN] such time as he desires.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much amused at the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BROWN] in which he brings the Steel Trust into this debate and in which he implies that the Steel Trust is not satisfied with the present order as of this day. According to a recent report of the Federal Trade Commission—a commission of this administration—the Steel Trust under the N.R.A. is able to enjoy privileges which were denied to the Steel Trust under former administrations and the benefits that the Steel Trust is now obtaining under the N.R.A. will annually cost the agricultural sections of the country \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000, which benefits have been denied to the Steel Trust by the previous administrations. In other words, the N.R.A., under the manner in which it is now being administered, is permitting the Steel Trust to do that which it was barred from doing prior to the enactment of the N.R.A. and the suspension of monopoly laws. So much for the Steel Trust. My objection is not to the N.R.A. as a law but the manner in which it is being administered.

Let us come now to the so-called "Wirt hearing" and let us take the history of it from its beginning. We have been holding a hearing under a resolution introduced by a Democratic Member from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], under a resolution presented to this House by a Democratic-controlled Rules Committee and passed by this House, nearly three fourths of the Membership of which are Democrats. That is the hearing which we have been holding, sired and sponsored by the Democratic membership of the House—not by the Republican membership, not by me, but by the Democratic membership. It is your hearing, it is your resolution, your Member was the author of it, and your membership passed it in this House.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] a few moments ago referred to me as the wet nurse for Dr. Wirt. Very well. Let us call the roll on that. As a member of the committee, the first time I ever saw Dr. Wirt was when he appeared before the committee. I never saw Dr. Wirt again until he appeared before the committee today. Every word that I have ever uttered to Dr. Wirt I uttered to him as a member of that committee in open session.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUGIN. No. I do not yield. Here is what I have done. I have tried, as best I could, to stand on this floor and obtain common, simple justice for Dr. Wirt, and I will do the same thing for the most lowly citizen of the country. I have said that the committee has not played the game fairly with Dr. Wirt, because in the first place it denied to him the right to make an opening statement, and when it denied to Dr. Wirt the right to make an opening statement it denied to him a right which had been enjoyed by the hundreds and thousands of other witnesses who have appeared before congressional committees, both House and Senate.

On this floor a few days ago the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], made the bold statement that Dr. Wirt had served time in jail at Gary, Ind., for his pro-German activities during the war.

A few moments thereafter, at the request of Hon. James A. Reed, I took the floor for 1 minute to make the statement that the charge that Dr. Wirt had been in jail for disloyalty was false and that his record was clean. I did not do that because I was a wet nurse for Dr. Wirt; I did it in common justice to a citizen of this country. When I did it the gen-

tleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], Democratic leader, rose in his place and charged me with playing petty politics. Since when is it petty politics to stand upon the floor of the House of Representatives and make the humble suggestion that a statement that a man has been in jail for disloyalty is false when, indeed, it is false? I was not then playing the role of a wet nurse for Dr. Wirt; I was extending only common decency and common justice to a fellow citizen of my country; yes, the common justice that I would extend to a dog.

Let us go a little further. Throughout this entire proceeding we have been confronted with a reign of terror and abuse upon anyone who would rise to criticize. Not only did the chairman of the committee stand upon this floor and charge that Dr. Wirt had been in jail for disloyalty but he remained silent for 5 full days and never retracted his statement until every newspaper in this country had carried the correction and proved the falsity of that statement. Not alone that, but Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes called a press conference, and it was reported in the press that Dr. Wirt had taken his present position because the Public Works Administrator, Mr. Ickes, had forbidden Wirt to reach into the sacred Public Works fund, for his own personal interest.

In answer to that, Dr. Wirt denied the statement, and no one has offered a scintilla of evidence that Dr. Wirt ever tried to despoil the Public Works funds for his own personal interest as the Secretary of the Interior said he did in the statement which he gave to the press.

Not alone that, yesterday the ranking member of this committee stood upon this floor and charged me with violating the rules of this House, charged me with practicing deceit and deception upon this House, and never retracted it until the documentary evidence was forced upon him and until the Speaker of the House had declared that I had obtained the right to insert my speech of last Friday.

Whatever may be said of the Dr. Wirt hearing, it has brought about another issue now, and that issue is: Can an American citizen—any American citizen—be subpoenaed before a congressional committee and be compelled to give testimony under oath without his fair name being vilified and slandered on the floor of the House by the chairman of that committee; whether he can be subpoenaed here without his good name being vilified and slandered, and falsely so, by a Cabinet officer of this Government?

It is now quite apparent that he who rises to criticize must face the ordeal of having his fair name defamed. Not alone Wirt; what about Lindbergh; what about Rickenbacker? What crime has either of them committed except that they rose to criticize? This is one of the issues that is now before the American people, and if this country of ours is to be a land of the free, it must be a land where a citizen can come before a congressional committee and testify without his name and character being vilified on the floor of the House or by Cabinet officers.

They did not even wait until Dr. Wirt appeared before the congressional committee to start vilifying his name. It was reported in the press that the Speaker of the House said that if Dr. Wirt did not testify he would be placed in jail. That statement was heralded to the country before he testified. What occasion was there for that statement? Dr. Wirt had not said he would not testify. That statement could serve but one purpose only, namely, to intimidate the witness before he appeared, and to discredit him before the country before he gave his testimony.

No matter what may come of the Wirt proceedings, it has disclosed that Frederick Howe, the man who is consumers' counsel in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, is the same Frederick Howe who was commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island in 1919, the same Frederick Howe, of whom a great Representative, a great liberal, a great patriot, Mr. LaGuardia, now mayor of New York City, in substance, upon the floor of the House, said the following:

Mr. Howe has a right to believe in a law or not, as he sees fit; but as a public official he has no right to ignore it. As Com-

missioner of Immigration at Ellis Island it is his duty to deport anarchists, but instead of deporting them he is acting as their counsel.

This was the statement of Mr. LaGuardia, made upon the floor of this House. Thereafter Mr. Howe resigned. Yet that man is back in the Government service in this administration, after he had betrayed his duty in the Wilson administration.

Come what may from the Wirt investigation, this much more has been disclosed: That one Mr. Robert Bruere is now at the head of the cotton textile code, and within his clutches is the cotton industry of this country. He holds his appointment under this administration. This same man in 1919 and 1922 was writing articles for a pamphlet issued by the Civil Liberties Union, which pamphlet was in defense of the I.W.W.'s; and in his articles he severely criticized the Department of Justice under the Wilson administration for the conduct of that Department toward the I.W.W.'s during the war. Yet today that same man, that same defender of the I.W.W.'s, that same critic of the Department of Justice under the Wilson administration, holds within his hand the destiny of the cotton industry of this country.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUGIN. No.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I merely wish to say the gentleman is not correct in that statement; that was not the testimony.

Mr. McGUGIN. I have no objection to this administration's throwing Republicans out of office and placing Democrats in office, if indeed they be Democrats. I am opposed to men being thrown out of office and being replaced by men whose political philosophy is communistic and who are as far from the Democratic platform in principle as the East is from the West. Let me say that no party had a more patriotic platform, no party ever offered a better platform from the standpoint of patriotism than did the Democratic Party in 1932. [Applause.] But what do we find? An administration elected to office on that platform has appointed men to office whose philosophy of government is contrary to that platform and whose philosophy of government is in keeping with the socialistic platform. Call the roll of Rexford Tugwell, Jerome Frank, Frederic Howe, and more of them, and it would be in perfect keeping that they were in executive positions if Mr. Thomas had been elected President, but it is not in perfect keeping for any administration that was elected upon the platform of the Democratic Party of 1932. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Kansas refers again to the statement that I made on the floor last week, it might not be inappropriate for me to say that a Member of Congress, and a very reliable Member, brought a lawyer to me from Indiana who made the statement to me as a report that during the war Dr. Wirt, on account of pro-German activities, was imprisoned at Gary, Ind.; that his friends claimed he was in there for protection from a mob. I should have said this the other day, and I corrected what I said in the RECORD, by the words "whether or not that charge was true." There are quite a few charges and reports about Dr. Wirt as to which I could say "whether or not those charges were true", but again I say that we were not trying to persecute Dr. Wirt. I cared little about him.

I started this investigation with absolute honesty to see whether there were any who had made these remarks that Dr. Wirt said had been made in the Rand evidence given to the committee. The committee went into this very carefully, and I tell you it was pitiful to see, on the one hand, Dr. Wirt, and again it was pitiful to see the strain that the gentleman from Kansas was under in trying to make a mountain out of a molehill.

I do not like to talk about Dr. Wirt. I do not know whether the man has wheels in his head or wiggletails in his think tank, but I do know that here was a man who reported to the country that six people holding minor, subordinate positions in the Federal Government, and under oath gave their names, were the people who were going to destroy the Government. God pity the soul of a man who has not the manhood now, after all that has come out, to stand up and say, "I was mistaken in what I said."

I might have gone into this further. Here was a man who held this secret in his bosom and let no one know about it from the 1st of September until the 17th of March, and then he sprung it on an unsuspecting people. He could remember every word that the lady said, who had not read Dr. Tugwell's books and who had not even read any of his writings, yet for 3 hours she rehearsed it to him. Pitiful? Yes; it is. I am especially sorry that any American citizen would so attempt to detract from the character of these people serving the Government down here.

But the gentleman from Kansas needed a political issue and he needed something to make a showing in reference to this regimentation that was going on. By the way, Robert LeBruere has not control of the textile code at all. There was no evidence of that. He is in that division.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Reference was made to Lawrence Todd, who represents in the Soviet Republic what corresponds to the Associated Press, an inoffensive, meek, mild, likeable individual. Everybody loves Lawrence Todd who knows him. He was one of these "dangerous characters." He and two women were going to overthrow the Government because of their influence on the President. The gentleman from Kansas would have carried that on and on and on if he had had a chance, but now he is sore because his issue has gone up in smoke. So now he comes back to regimentation. Suppose we do have some regimentation now in order to get back to prosperity. As we heard not so long ago, during the entire time of the Hoover administration we had regimentation of unemployment lines seeking bread. It was just that. We had regimentation when this bonus army came to Washington. But, thank God, we are going to have a different kind of regimentation in this country now.

I do not like to go into what the committee is going to report. I do not know. I think and I feel that it has been absolutely improper for any Member of this House on a committee, before the committee hands down a decision and makes its report, to take the floor of the House and talk about it. Yet these things cannot be helped sometimes when you have a gentleman who is so politically minded and would like to find something down here in the Government that he could get hold of to bolster up his ideas. He cannot find a thing.

I do not care to talk about this any more.

All that happened was that six people went to a dinner and took a guest with them. For 5 hours he—Dr. Wirt—talked about the devaluation of currency or some such thing as that and let no one have a word edgewise in the entire evening. They all went away saying that they were absolutely bored to death with Dr. Wirt's talk, and Dr. Wirt's talk reminds me a great deal of the gentleman from Kansas. Both will bore you if you listen to them long enough.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this special committee of the House to inquire into the charges made by Dr. Wirt, which committee has been subjected to some abuse, not from the lovely old doctor from Indiana but from at least one of my Republican colleagues on that committee, I want to say that in the beginning I was not so enthusiastic that this House should dignify this school teacher by having a hearing at which he might appear and



air his views. The demand, as we interpreted it, from the public, however, became so great that the leadership of the House felt we ought to inquire into these charges, and, unfortunately for me, I was appointed a member of that special committee. Since then I have done my utmost to investigate the charges made by this scholastic gentleman from Indiana.

Somebody has said it is a close race as to whether Indiana will become famous by reason of Dr. Wirt or by reason of John Dillinger. [Laughter.]

I now have the impression that this committee will not have to report to the House, because, due to the explosive industry of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGugin], all that has happened or might have happened before the committee has already been reported in great detail to the House. While the action of the gentleman from Kansas may have violated the proprieties of the House, it has at least saved us a lot of trouble in sitting down and writing out a report of the extraordinarily boring hearings.

My Republican colleague from Coffeyville, Kans., comes from that great State which has been heretofore famous for its cyclones, its cattle tick, its grasshoppers, the matchless, sockless Jerry Simpson, the rampant Carrie Nation, and the vigilant Mary Ellen Lease. Now its power has been broadcast to the world by one HAROLD MCGUGIN, Representative in Congress from Cherokee County, who has taken this hearing more seriously than even Dr. Wirt himself. It is an even race as to who is the "persecuted victim" of this "un-American proceeding" in the protests of the gentleman from Kansas. If it is not Dr. Wirt it must be Mr. McGugin. In his autobiography in the Congressional Directory, the gentleman from Kansas emphasizes the fact that he is a member of the Inns of Court, London. This boast comes as a great surprise to me. When the O'Connors were kings of Ireland and most of the then known world, the McGugins or O'Googans were loyal subjects in the south of Ireland. How a McGugin or an O'Googan could so long forget the national antipathy of the Irish to British oppression to join the Inns of Court in London, of all places, is beyond my comprehension.

I heard the gentleman from Kansas speak about the great prosperity of the Steel Trust in the recent months under our administration. This may be true. I do not know. I pay little attention to the financial reports of this trust or any other trust, but I do know that for the first time in 70 years an administration of our Government has seen to it that that monopoly and that octopus must pay a living wage to its employees. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Kansas mentioned today that the distinguished counsel for Dr. Wirt, ex-Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, appeared before our committee and demanded that Dr. Wirt be permitted to first make an opening statement and to then submit himself to examination. The distinguished ex-Member of the Senate from Missouri and the member of the committee from Kansas delivered several orations in which they said such a method of procedure was usual and the undeviated-from method of conducting such legislative inquiries. When the majority of the committee voted down the proposition that this Indiana scholar make first an oration before our committee, such as he had made for at least 4 hours out there in Virginia, there was a violent protest from ex-Senator Reed, the gentleman from Kansas, and a mild protest from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], and again today there was a great protest at the hearing.

Very seldom am I industrious; but yesterday afternoon I went over to the Senate library, and I dug out the hearings of a Senate committee, conducted in 1926, inquiring into the elections of certain Senators. One case was the election in Illinois where one Frank L. Smith claimed to have been elected. Another case was in Pennsylvania, where our ex-colleague, the Honorable William S. Vare, claimed to have been elected. This committee was presided over by the same distinguished gentleman, ex-Senator Reed, of Missouri; and

today may I quote Senator Reed from many pages of that testimony where he denied any witnesses, whether they were Senators or whether they were Members of the House of Representatives, the right to make any opening statement before his own committee. You all remember a distinguished man who sat on the Republican side of the House, Mr. Allen Moore, of Chicago. Allen Moore came before Senator Reed's committee as a witness, as did also the Honorable Frank L. Smith. Both of these distinguished gentlemen desired to make a statement before Senator Reed's committee before they were submitted to examination, and the same ex-Senator, James A. Reed, presiding as chairman of that committee, said, "Why nothing like that was ever heard of in the history of investigating committees." [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Chairman, it all depends on which side of the table you are sitting.

Now, the excited gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGugin] has again referred today to the remarks that I made on the floor of this House yesterday to the effect that the gentleman had violated the rules of the House by extending his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without first obtaining the permission of the House. As you all know, I withdrew my remarks from the RECORD, so there is nothing now in the RECORD or before the House about which the gentleman should properly speak; but, as I said to the House yesterday, I still maintain that we are in a quandary in this House if we cannot rely upon the printed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which there was not one word giving the gentleman from Kansas any permission to extend his remarks, but, finally, the reporters found page 200, which had been "dropped on the steps" between the House and the reporters' room. Well, the gentleman from Kansas may take what comfort out of that unusual explanation he sees fit. I do not feel the least bit guilty about what I said, because I had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before me, and every morning when I read that RECORD I feel I am entitled to rely upon it and proceed in accordance with it. This is the first occasion of which I know when that RECORD was not correct in such a particular.

The gentleman from Kansas has made a vicious attack upon our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. He has also made an attack upon our most distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, whom we all love [Mr. RAINEY]. He has stated that our Speaker said if Dr. Wirt came here and refused to testify, he would go to jail. Well, that is the law. If any witness, before any of our committees, refuses to testify, we can send the witness to jail. Why should we not do so? That is the only way a legislative body can deal with a recalcitrant witness. Mr. Chairman, there were intimations in the newspapers that Dr. Wirt would stubbornly refuse to testify. When we went into that hearing on the 10th of this month, we, the majority of the committee, were given to understand that Dr. Wirt would not testify, by naming the "revolutionists" who talked to him; and he, in effect corroborated that press comment, because he was only half through his testimony when he said, in effect, "Now, gentlemen, I refuse to state any more", and thereupon he sat down. That action on the part of the doctor would not have annoyed the committee in itself, because by that time the doctor, by reason of his irresponsible monologue, had bored the press, the public in attendance; but more obviously his own counsel, ex-Senator Reed. But the committee had a duty to perform, to ascertain the truth or falsity of the doctor's charges; so with great patience we proceeded.

All you ladies and gentlemen undoubtedly read in the newspapers that Dr. Wirt had told the press before the hearing that he had carefully locked up in his office in Gary, Ind., the home of the United States Steel Trust, the names of the people to whom he had talked in Washington and who had disclosed to him this "revolution." That was stated and reiterated by Dr. Wirt; and the testimony before our committee today was especially to the effect that only the day before the hearing, to wit, on the Monday before

the Tuesday of the hearing, April 10, Dr. Wirt's wife walked up back-alleys and side streets, stating that she feared she was being followed—by whom she did not say—and then went to Miss Barrows, the lady who gave the dinner in Virginia, and asked her to give the names of those to whom the doctor had talked at Miss Barrows' home. It was therefore not until the day before the hearing that Dr. Wirt even had the names of the people who, he claimed, had divulged to him the secrets of this great "revolution", this great "overthrow" of the Government. Of course, the scholastic doctor took all that back and frankly stated that by "revolution", a word he had deliberately used to arouse the country, he did not mean a revolution to overthrow the Government by force of arms. He stated he meant only a revolution to overthrow the existing social order. No greater anticlimax was ever confessed.

The only two projects the doctor mentioned as tending to overthrow the existing social order were the housing program and the homestead program. How terrible! Those innovations are so repulsive to his Republican standpatism as to what should be the course of our national social order, after his tutelage of 25 years under the Steel Trust in Gary, that he could not possibly endure it. It became an obsession with him. One look at him would convince anyone that he was psychopathic.

The steel company's doctor admitted that there is not going to be any revolution of arms. The "revolutionists" are not going to seize the Capitol. They are not going to assassinate our President. They are rather planning at dinners in the Old Dominion to overthrow "the existing social order", whatever that is. Imagine, they are advocating the terrible housing program to take our people out of the slums and give them a decent place in which to live. Imagine, these "revolutionists" advocate the establishment of homestead developments! They really want to take care of people in the rural sections! Reds? Why anyone who would advocate such proletariat projects surely must be "red", to Dr. Wirt's mind, at least.

Now, about Mr. Bruere. Of course, Mr. Bruere has absolutely nothing to do with the cotton industry, contrary to what the gentleman from Kansas said. Mr. Bruere is connected with the cotton-textile industry, which is very much different from the cotton industry of the South. But the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGugin] attempts to interpret, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Brown] has well pointed out, the testimony of Mr. Bruere, which testimony will be found to be absolutely not subject to any such interpretation as placed upon it by the alarmed gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGugin].

Now, "flop" is a mild word to express the result of these hearings before our committee. I do not feel that I could possibly endure the ennui of another hearing. Enough is enough!

I am sure the newspapermen present in great numbers at the two hearings could not possibly endure another session. I am, moreover, positive that the audience would not attend. They have been bored to death, although that is immaterial.

Mr. Chairman, there is undoubtedly a great protest from certain big manufacturers, Wall Street brokers, and big business men of this country against what this administration proposes to do in the future as to legislation. I do not know whether the "Committee for the Nation" has supported the policies of this administration, as the gentleman from Kansas claims, but you will recall that this "pipe dream" of Dr. Wirt was first read by the chairman of the Committee for the Nation before a committee of our House—the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—which committee was considering at that time the stock exchange bill. Dr. Wirt's statement was read in opposition to that bill and not in support of it, as the gentleman from Kansas would lead us to believe. I believe that every pending piece of legislation before us is now violently and vehemently opposed by this same Committee for the Nation, and that Dr.

Wirt has been truly characterized at the hearings as an agent of that Committee for the Nation. That is "the nigger in the woodpile." That is why all this smoke cloud has been raised through the instrumentality of this old gentleman from Indiana, who, incidentally, came to my city of New York in 1914. At that time that distinguished gentleman, the late Mr. John Purroy Mitchel, was mayor of the city of New York. He invited Dr. Wirt to come there—of course, for very attractive pay; our committee paid him at the rate of over \$1 per minute. Mayor Mitchel asked Dr. Wirt to install the Gary school system in the city of New York. That was a contract.

Of course, the people of New York City soon woke up to the fact that the Gary school system had as its sole objective not to train the student in "reading, writing, and arithmetic", but to train the child solely so that at the age of 12 or 14 he could take a tool in his or her hand and go into a factory and perform manual labor. The Steel Trust had worked it out beautifully in Gary under Dr. Wirt. That is the whole principle of the Gary system—train them for industry at the age of 14 or less, and not train them mentally. Well, Mr. Chairman, we had a municipal campaign in the city of New York in 1917. Mr. Mitchel ran for reelection. The Democratic Party nominated Mr. John F. Hylan for mayor—and, mark you, the sole issue in that campaign was the Gary school system advocated by the same Dr. Wirt upon the invitation of the then present mayor, the Honorable John Purroy Mitchel. The people of New York City then and there decided that the Gary school system could not be introduced into the city of New York. They wanted their children educated, not made the slaves of industry.

The people of the city of New York decided most emphatically that they were interested in educating their children for higher things rather than merely to use a tool and work in a factory conducted by big business at the age of 14. The people of the city of New York expressed their opinion of the Gary school system and of Dr. Wirt by electing Mr. Hylan by a plurality of 500,000. Whereupon Dr. Wirt retired to Gary and was taken off the pay roll of New York City.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of names have been mentioned here today by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGugin] as being members of the "brain trust", to wit, Mr. Tugwell, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Richberg, Mr. Frank, and some others. He and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] are trying desperately to make the country believe that these distinguished gentlemen are a menace to our Government and our Nation's progress. Well, these particular gentlemen may have ideas that may not be consonant with mine or yours. I care not for that. We can take care of that. We may have a Tugwell, we may have a Wallace, we may have a Howe, we may have a Richberg, we may have a Frank, and we may have "brain trusters", but, Mr. Chairman, thank God that this Democratic administration under Franklin D. Roosevelt has not got a Fall or a Daugherty or a Forbes or a Miller or a Postmaster General Brown. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, much false and misleading information, which is pure political propaganda in an effort to prejudice the people, has gone out concerning the independent offices appropriation bill recently passed by Congress.

Some Members of Congress have been charged with voting to override the President's veto in order to get an increase in salary. Others are being charged with voting to sustain the veto in order to get a salary increase.

The fact is all Federal employees, including Members of Congress, would have received a salary restoration, either way Congress voted. If Members voted to override the veto, they could be charged with voting for 10-percent restoration



of salary; if they voted to sustain the President's veto, they could be charged with voting for a 15-percent increase.

I desire, therefore, to submit some cold facts from the record. The Economy Act, passed March 20, 1933, reduced all Federal salaries 15 percent, but the provisions relating to salaries expired automatically June 30, 1934. If the independent offices bill, continuing 5 percent of the pay cut, had failed to become a law, there would have been no legislation of that nature this session, and the full 15-percent salary reduction would have been restored July 1, 1934.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in my mind there is no question in the world about the matter, that if we had not passed the independent offices appropriation bill there would have been a full restoration of all salaries on July 1, because any posted man here knows that there could not have possibly been legislation passed to have stopped it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the able gentleman from Texas for his straightforward statement. I especially appreciate it, coming from the gentleman who consistently fights for economy. It all amounts to this: A vote to override the veto was a vote for a salary reduction, despite charges to the contrary, and not a Member of this floor today, regardless of how he voted, will deny that statement.

Another thing. The President was not opposed to salary restoration, as some seem to think. On the other hand he asked for a flat 5-percent salary increase for Federal employees, with the power to make an additional increase up to 10 percent as living costs advanced. He objected to certain provisions of the bill affecting veterans because of wrong information given him.

Again, it has been erroneously stated the bill provided increased veterans' benefits costing \$228,000,000. It has been found, however, that instead of restoring veterans to the amount of \$228,000,000 that the total will be \$76,712,500. But the amount in controversy was \$20,000,000, regardless of the propaganda broadcast to the contrary.

The independent offices bill carried the following increases for veterans:

1. For disabled Spanish War veterans.....	\$37,400,000
2. To restore veterans with service-connected disabilities to the schedules prior to passage of the Economy Act.....	30,000,000
3. To restore World War presumptively service-connected cases on a 75-percent basis.....	9,312,500
Total.....	76,712,500

By an Executive order the day the bill was vetoed, the President restored the presumptives to the rolls and also the Spanish War veterans, pending a new review of their cases by the Board of Appeals. He, however, did not propose to restore full compensation to the service-connected disabled. I do not think that, in view of the rising cost of living, that Congress can be severely criticized for restoring these battle casualties to the rates they were receiving prior to March 20, 1933.

The Veterans' Administration, a direct agency of the executive branch, estimates that the plan adopted by Congress will cost about \$20,000,000 more than the one proposed by the President, and not \$228,000,000 as charged by those who went off half-cocked before they knew the facts.

Another thing these big dailies "forgot" to tell the public is that the same bill continues salary cuts and other economies of the Economy Act which will save around \$125,000,000 annually, which means that passage of this bill cuts around \$105,000,000 off the expenses of the Government for the next fiscal year. It reduces the salary of every Member of this House \$500 a year.

Yet, the charge is made brazenly and with a total disregard of the facts by a big daily newspaper in Oklahoma, and one or two of the smaller ones, that Members of Congress who voted for this bill voted to raise their own salaries and to saddle additional expenses upon the Government.

The editors who made those statements should have known that was not true. Perhaps they did. Perhaps they did not go to the trouble to find out what they were writing about because they wanted to stir up public resentment against me and other Members of Congress they have been unable to control and to dictate to on various matters. It is not the first attacks these newspapers have made, but so far they have been unable to fool the people, and now they resort to cheap propaganda in a desperate effort to prejudice the public against Members of Congress.

The RECORD will show that this House made every effort to separate the salary and veterans' legislation; but that after the bill we had passed to reduce our salaries \$1,000 a year came back from the Senate, it had been amended to restore all of the salary cuts and included also legislation for veterans. When this House refused to strike out the Senate amendments, a proposition I voted for, it was impossible to separate the two propositions.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield with pleasure to our distinguished floor leader.

Mr. BYRNS. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I think we all realize, as the gentleman from Texas stated, and he is eminently correct in his remarks—that if we had not overridden the President's veto there would have been a full salary restoration on the 1st of July.

In the same connection I may say, if the gentleman will permit me to do so at this time, that I am sure no Member on this side of the Chamber has supported the President more loyally and more earnestly in all those measures looking to the success of his plan for recovery and restoration of our country to prosperity than the gentleman from Oklahoma. [Applause.] There is no question of his loyalty to the President and to all those things for which the President stands, and I know that the President relies upon the gentleman from Oklahoma as he does upon other leading Democrats of this House in his effort to restore prosperity to the country. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am deeply grateful for the very generous compliment that our Democratic floor leader has been kind enough to pay me.

To clear up any misunderstanding on the salary question, it is only necessary to refer to the official record. It is one thing to make wild assertions but the record speaks for itself. I hold in my hand the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11. I turn to page 487 and I find a letter from the President of the United States to Chairman BUCHANAN of the Appropriations Committee asking that 5 percent of the Federal salary cut be restored. I call your attention to the following in the President's letter to Chairman BUCHANAN:

I have recommended a flat restoration of 5 percent, or one third of the 15-percent reduction, this restoration to apply to the next fiscal year. I have asked also for authority to restore such portions of the balance of 10 percent as may be warranted by a possible further increase in the cost of living. I hope that your committee will go along with these suggestions.

Until so requested by the President of the United States, I had steadfastly refused to vote for any portion of pay restoration of Federal salaries under any circumstances.

The House followed the President's suggestion and passed a bill to continue 10 percent of the salary reduction next year.

My record for economy on the salary matter and on other questions during consideration of this bill speaks for itself. There were numerous roll calls on this bill from the time it was introduced January 11 until it came here for final passage. Seven times during consideration of this measure the roll was called on whether or not we would increase salaries and other expenditures, and the RECORD will show that I voted with the Democratic leaders for economy at every opportunity. Not only did I vote to follow the President on the salary question, and even voted for the "gag" rule, which we hoped would fulfill the wishes of the President on the salary question, but when the final show-down came on making a choice between having the temporary provisions of

the Economy Act expire next June 30 or helping these disabled war veterans, I voted to cut my own salary and do something for these helpless and mistreated war veterans.

When the bill came back to us from the Senate, it had been increased to the tune of \$354,432,124. During consideration of the Senate amendments I voted consistently for economy and took the floor to plead for economy. I voted against the Senate amendment to restore these so-called "emergency officers" and helped kill that amendment placed in the bill by the Senate but eliminated by the House.

In speaking on this floor March 14, when the bill was pending, in opposition of the Senate amendment proposing to restore these emergency officers to the rolls, I said:

We saw the sorry spectacle of former officers who had never posed as being disabled prior to the passage of the emergency officers' act take advantage of it and get on the Government pay roll at from \$100 to \$400 a month. We saw some "swivel-chair heroes" who never smelled powder nor saw the smoke of battle, but who sat at mahogany desks in Washington with as little as 13 days' service, manage to get themselves retired at from \$200 to \$400 a month. We saw generals who had never led an army, nor fired a gun, nor who ever were within 3,000 miles of the front lines get themselves retired at \$416 a month. If you vote for the Senate amendment, you vote to place a large number of the generals, colonels, majors, and captains back on the pay roll. There seems to be some disagreement as to the number, but that is not the question. Those of us who want to do something for the disabled veterans of both wars, who are really in need, do not wish to be hog-tied to that provision of the Senate amendment which would put back on the pay roll emergency officers, many of whom are not in need and who should not, in my judgment, have any more consideration than is given the buck private who might have the same disabilities.

I helped save the House economy compromise. Had I changed my vote, the House plan would have been lost and the Senate amendment adopted, as will be shown by roll call no. 107, on March 16, when the economy plan was carried by a single vote. In short, it cost Members of Congress exactly \$500 to support the House bill over the bill as passed by the Senate.

The controversy was not over the salary question, as a few newspapers would make the people believe. It was chiefly over the 29,000 presumptive veterans. Most of those attacking Members of Congress for passing this bill are frank to say they feel that private charity should take care of these helpless veterans, because they could not prove to the satisfaction of the hard-boiled Republican head of the Veterans' Administration that the poison gas they inhaled in France caused their tuberculosis or that the horrors of the front-line trenches resulted in their mental ills. There was not enough money raised by private charity in the entire State of Oklahoma last year for this purpose to take care of more than a mere fraction of the handful of presumptives living in that State.

Is it not rather striking that some of those who are so critical about 1 vote that does not suit their liking have condoned the dishing-out of millions and even billions of dollars to failed banks and shaky corporations through the Hoover Reconstruction Finance Corporation? Is it not peculiar that newspapers which assailed me for voting against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Hoover moratorium, both lavish and costly subsidies, to big corporations and international bankers, should now be criticizing me for voting to assist 29,000 helpless men?

This same group declared that private charity should take care of the unemployed and the drought-stricken farmers. Congress was assailed when we proposed a Federal appropriation to feed hungry people and provide work for them. These advocates of "rugged individualism" proposed to raise \$50,000,000 by private subscription to feed 25,000,000 hungry people while the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was dishing out its billions of Government money to big business.

These 29,000 veterans, whose physical and mental ills were presumed to have been caused by war service, had been cut off by the harsh and unreasonable rules of the Veterans' Administration. Physicians testified before the committee that it was impossible to tell when and how tuberculosis originated. Congress, therefore, did not feel justifi-

fied in leaving to a board of laymen a final decision in such cases, because the past record revealed that some of these boards had denied compensation to men who later were able to prove they were battle casualties.

May I say here that I voted for the Economy Act a year ago in good faith, just as I have loyally supported the rest of the President's recovery program; but I must admit that I was surprised and chagrined that the Director of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration were permitted to promulgate rules under that act that cut off 300,000 service-connected veterans, including tuberculars and battle casualties. Speaking on the floor of this House on May 26, 1933, shortly after those harsh and inhumane rules had been announced, I stated in part:

I desire at this time to enter a protest against the heartless, cruel, cold-blooded, and unreasonable manner in which those officials in charge of administering the veterans' laws propose to deal with our helpless and disabled war veterans. As one who voted for the Economy Act because of assurances given me by those in whom I had the utmost confidence, and because of my sincere desire to stand by our great President, I say here and now that I shall insist that this House remain in session until Christmas, if need be, in order to correct the wrong that is evidently about to be done to many of our disabled war veterans unless drastic action is taken before June 30.

The House amendment, for which I voted to correct these injustices, and for which abuse has been heaped upon Members of Congress, takes the matter out of the hands of appeal boards or the Veterans' Administration and gives these men a square deal under the law. But it does not place back on the rolls one non-service-connected war veteran.

Many of the appeal boards were unscientific and unreliable. Records of the Veterans' Administration show that the decisions of the special boards varied widely in the percentage of appeals allowed. The central office here allowed only 22.19 percent of the appeals; the Hines, Ill., board allowed 23.70 percent of the appeals; on up to the Charlotte, N.C., board which granted compensation to 74.68 percent of those who appealed, the highest percentage for any of the many boards scattered throughout the country. There was no rime, reason, or justice in that and no explanation why one board would allow three times as many appeals as another board.

The fight in Congress was simply a disagreement over matters of policy. No one wanted to deny compensation to any deserving veteran or to grant compensation to any undeserving one. But deserving cases were being denied and Congress proposed to remedy that and to cut out the red tape that in many cases was not unraveled until the veterans were dead or so near dead with tuberculosis that the benefits of belated compensation arrived too late to save him.

Those of us here know what red tape is. Anyone who has had any part in presenting a veteran's claim for compensation knows what red tape is. Farmers who plowed up cotton last summer and who have been trying unsuccessfully since to get their Government checks know what red tape is.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my respect and sincere affection for the President. I have supported him wholeheartedly and consistently on his recovery program, as stated a few minutes ago by our distinguished floor leader. With the single exception of this matter of veterans' legislation, I challenge any Member on this floor to show a more consistent record for having supported the President.

Some of the newspapers now attacking this Congress cannot say so much. They frequently have attacked the recovery program. Some of them have carried very unfriendly and unjustified comment on the air-mail controversy and against the stock market bill. I predict they will attack other provisions of the recovery program before this session is over.

Let me cite my record for economy during consideration of this bill. When the bill came back from the Senate increased to the tune of \$354,432,124 I stood with the Speaker and leaders on the Democratic side of this aisle to vote



against those amendments, but we lost by a vote of 247 to 169, as roll call no. 103 on page 4518 of the RECORD will show. On six other roll calls during consideration of this measure I voted for economy. I cite them as follows:

On January 11, roll no. 78, page 483; January 11, roll no. 79, page 510; January 11, roll no. 80, page 511; March 16, roll no. 106; page 4690; March 16, roll no. 107, page 4699; March 22, roll no. 113, page 5180.

May I state in closing that I have given facts from the official RECORD? These facts speak for themselves. I am not disturbed by the unfair tactics employed by my political enemies. Such tactics have failed in the past and will fail in the future. The charge that in voting to restore the helpless tuberculars I was making a bid for votes is absurd. There are only a handful of these veterans affected residing in the district I represent in Congress. No one knows better than I that it was poor politics to vote for those sick men, many of whom are physically unable to get to voting places. It is no easy task to vote even once against the wishes of the President. But I voted my conscientious convictions in the interest of men who had been ruthlessly wronged by the Government they fought to defend when this Nation needed real men. They did not fail us then—and by the eternals, I cannot fail them now! [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SEARS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 9061, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. WOOD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a part of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Forney Johnson, representing the Alabama coal operators at a hearing on code amendments for the bituminous-coal industry at Washington, D.C., on April 11, 1934.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. Forney Johnston, representing Alabama coal operators, at hearing on code amendments for the bituminous-coal industry, Washington, D.C., April 11, 1934:

Mr. Administrator, I have reduced the request which I wished to make before the conclusion of this hearing to writing in order that I might condense it as much as possible. I hesitate, and I am sure and I trust you believe I am sincere, in making this statement that I resent the statement that was made that the operators whom I represent are not cooperating with the purposes of the hearing. That is not the situation. We are compelled to make this request because the hearing has now had an end. This matter will receive, undoubtedly, in due course consideration by the staffs, with the remote possibility, so far as the result is concerned, that our mines will be closed, our industry will be in utter demoralization, and a heavy and undue burden thrown upon the public relief in the State of Alabama. We made every effort we could to have this order suspended pending the orderly hearing pursuant to the code on the question of these proposed amendments. We have been unable so far to obtain any results. For that reason, I desire to request, as a matter of right under the code, the immediate assembling of the National Bituminous Coal Industrial Board provided for by article VII, section 4, of the code to consider and to make recommendations to the divisional code authority and to the President as to any amendments of (the) code or other measures which may stabilize and improve the conditions of the industry and promote the public interest therein.

I insist on behalf of the Alabama operators that no amendments be approved or imposed, whether agreed to on behalf of particular divisions or not until this board has made recommendations as to policies and has discharged the functions for which the board was intended.

Action by the Administrator in approving or imposing amendments without the recommendations of this board amount to a usurpation of the functions of the board, violate the covenant held out by the code itself and subject the policy and adminis-

tration of the coal code to impulsive and irrational action, such as characterized the premature approval of the amendments proposed by certain subdivisions of division no. 1 and subject the formulation of important policies to the grave charges of manipulation that would have been pressed at this hearing by the Smokeless Association.

Until there is a policy there is no code. It is still a mere matter of medieval bargaining between so-called "representatives" of the industry and so-called "representatives" of labor, rubber-stamped by the Administrator without information, definite policy, or any reaction whatever except the line of least resistance and the prevailing pressure of the moment.

Most important of all the prevailing system of code amendments, as evidenced by the arbitrary, illegal, and unwarranted action of the Administrator released on March 31, violated every basic principle and covenant of the code as far as division III is concerned and in particular that action junked and violated every basic study of fact assembled by the administration at great expense both to the administration and to the operators.

I refer particularly to the basic code assembled by the administration under article V (g).

I make the assertion here that the Administrator in approving the so-called "amendments" on March 31 not only did not act after recommendation by the industrial board but acted without knowledge of or reference to the data assembled under article V (g) and in both respects acted in violation of the code.

I insist that there can be no rational program under the one-man, here-one-minute-and-gone-the-next policy reflected in the so-called "amendments" of March 31, and I protest on behalf of the Alabama operators against any amendment whatsoever until policy has been defined and until the law and the code have been complied with.

These amendments combine the law of the jungle with the worst features of a military despotism and so far as the Alabama field is concerned the amendments are and will continue to be treated as null and void. Aside from that view, we are profoundly concerned with the redemption of the code system from the triumvirate rubber-stamped by the Administrator, and insist upon compliance not only with the law but with first necessity for any permanent reorganization or stabilization of the industry.

So far as we are concerned we have definitely and finally determined that we will not conform to any further one-man determination of policy and dictation in repudiation of essential basis and covenant of the code.

That conclusion on our part is final, and we are prepared to take the consequences in an effort to save this industry from a destination worse than the economic chaos of the past. As between civil war in the industry and subjection of the industry to three pro-consuls working through a military ringmaster, we prefer civil war.

Before acquiescing to either alternative we demand a trial of the covenants of the code and of the President's Executive order approving the code.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. CULLEN), for 1 week, on account of illness.

#### HOOR OF MEETING

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J.Res. 70. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John C. Merriam as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), in accordance with its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 18, 1934, at 11 o'clock a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

409. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1935,

amounting to \$54,224.83, for additional personnel and miscellaneous expenses of the Supreme Court (H.Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

410. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1935 and prior fiscal years, amounting to \$60,545.66, and three drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H.Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5624) granting compensation to Philip R. Roby; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H.R. 5487) for injury sustained by Robert W. Krieger; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. S. 1694. An act for the relief of the city of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H.R. 7098. A bill validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way, in and in the vicinity of the town of Gridley, all in the county of Butte, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 25, 1866 (14 Stat.L. 239); without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H.R. 7082. A bill validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way, in and in the vicinity of the city of Lodi, and near the station of Acampo, and in the city of Tracy, all in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in or in the vicinity of Galt, and Polk, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat.L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat.L. 356); with amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7208. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved March 19, 1906 (34 Stat. 70), as amended by the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1247); without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2508. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Attorney General of the United States, to make equitable adjustments of conflicting claims between the United States and other claimants of lands along the shores of the Potomac River, Anacostia River, and Rock Creek in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONTAGUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4337. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section

to be numbered 274D; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1810. An act to amend the act authorizing the issuance of the Spanish War Service Medal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2042. An act to establish a department of physics at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, N.Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on War Claims. S. 377. An act for the relief of the Fred G. Clark Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on War Claims. S. 1132. An act for the relief of Stanley A. Jerman, receiver for A. J. Peters Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on War Claims. H.R. 8528. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on War Claims. H.R. 2434. A bill for the relief of Meta de Rene McLoskey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on War Claims. H.R. 8210. A bill for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Brannan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H.R. 3119. A bill for the relief of Carrie McIntyre; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6099. A bill for the relief of Alfred Hohenlohe, Alexander Hohenlohe, Konrad Hohenlohe, and Viktor Hohenlohe by removing cloud on title; without amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H.R. 2033. A bill for the relief of George Fletcher Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H.R. 3775. A bill for the relief of Cora A. Snyder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan: A bill (H.R. 9175) to provide relief to depositors in closed banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 9176) to authorize the construction of a sewage-treatment plant in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONDON: A bill (H.R. 9177) authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make a loan for the



construction and operation of airships in overseas trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. NORTON (by request): A bill (H.R. 9178) to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FIESINGER: A bill (H.R. 9179) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H.R. 9180) relating to the incorporation of Columbus University, of Washington, D.C., organized under and by virtue of a certificate of incorporation pursuant to the incorporation laws of the District of Columbia as provided in subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIERMANN: A bill (H.R. 9181) to authorize the acquisition of additional land for the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H.R. 9182) to amend paragraph C of section 2 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi: A bill (H.R. 9183) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Meridian & Bigbee River Railway Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Naheola, Ala.," approved January 15, 1927; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana: A bill (H.R. 9184) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell the old Tenley School to the duly authorized representative of St. Ann's Church, of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEST of Texas: A bill (H.R. 9185) authorizing the International Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at Laredo, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H.R. 9186) to provide for a survey of the Chehalis River from the mouth of the Skookumchuck River to the deep water of the Chehalis River at the Grays Harbor County line, Washington; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILLFORD: A bill (H.R. 9187) to save the farmer from bankruptcy and to increase the buying power of all agricultural producers, also to help agriculture back to prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Resolution (H.Res. 340) for the consideration of S. 752, to amend section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended, with respect to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States over suits relating to orders of State administrative boards; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 325) extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission and extending until March 10, 1936, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbitrator; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 326) providing for a commission to study and make recommendation as to aviation in its relation to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H.R. 9188) for the relief of Stanislaus Lipowicz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H.R. 9189) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Barrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9190) granting a pension to Ethel Kapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9191) granting an increase of pension to Mamie F. Presley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H.R. 9192) for the relief of Ollie L. Brixner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H.R. 9193) for the relief of Charles A. Manuel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN: A bill (H.R. 9194) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Edward Dubied & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H.R. 9195) for the relief of Ned Williams; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of California: A bill (H.R. 9196) granting a pension to Ellen A. Van Hooser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H.R. 9197) authorizing the appointment and retirement of S. Meredith Strong as a major, Medical Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3946. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition of a copy of the resolution adopted by the board of aldermen, in the city of New York, favoring the amendment to section 301 of the Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating in the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making association of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3947. Also, resolution adopted by the Merchants Association of New York, to secure the prompt reestablishment of adequate air-mail facilities on a basis that will be fair alike to the Government, to the contractors who may successfully compete to supply that service, and to the general public, etc., to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3948. By Mr. BRUNNER: Petition of Saint Joan of Arc's Parish, Roman Catholic Church, Jackson Heights, Long Island, N.Y., supporting the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910 as submitted by a representative of Radio Station WLWL of New York City; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3949. Also, petition of Saint Pius V Holy Name Society, 106-112 Liverpool Street, Jamaica, N.Y., supporting the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910 as submitted by a representative of radio station WLWL of New York City; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3950. By Mr. CHASE: Petition of various citizens of Minnesota, urging that the National Securities Exchange Act be greatly modified or its passage postponed until the next session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3951. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the members of the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, calling upon the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States to support the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar nonprofit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating in the stat-

ute a provision for the allotment to said nonprofit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3952. By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 13, Philadelphia, Pa., with reference to House bill 7979; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3953. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution of the House of Representatives, of Columbia, S.C. (the senate concurring), that the Congress of the United States be, and it is respectfully, requested to enact appropriate laws to provide for a national system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

3954. By Mr. GAVAGAN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring highway aid to States; to the Committee on Roads.

3955. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Summit, N.Y., respectfully petitioning Congress for favorable action on the Patman motion-picture bill (H.R. 6097) providing higher moral standards for films entering interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3956. Also, petition of Schoharie Valley Star Chapter, No. 450, O.E.S., Schoharie, N.Y., respectfully petitioning Congress for favorable action on the Patman motion-picture bill (H.R. 6097) providing higher moral standards for films entering interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3957. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Howes Cave, N.Y., respectfully petitioning Congress for favorable action on the Patman motion-picture bill (H.R. 6097) providing for higher moral standards for films entering interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3958. Also, petition of the New York State Senate, Albany, N.Y., memorializing and petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States to enact during the present session such legislation as will provide an additional program of highway construction and improvement for 1934; to the Committee on Roads.

3959. By Mr. HOIDALE: Resolution by members of St. Patrick's Parish, Collis, Minn., supporting the amendment to section 301, Senate bill 2910, for equity for educational, religious, and other non-profit-making radio stations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3960. Also, resolution of members of Ave Maria Parish, Wheaton, Minn., supporting the amendment to section 301, Senate bill 2910 for equity for educational, religious, and other nonprofit-making radio associations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3961. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, requesting Congress to exert every effort to secure the prompt reestablishment of adequate air-mail facilities on a basis that will be fair alike to the Government, to the contractors who may successfully compete to supply that service, and to the general public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3962. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress to enact during the present session such legislation as will provide an additional program of highway construction and improvement for 1934 of at least \$500,000,000, to be allocated among the various States upon the same basis as was followed in connection with the apportionment made last year under the original \$400,000,000 fund, the additional \$500,000,000 fund to be administered under jurisdiction of the United States Bureau of Public Roads through the State highway department of the various States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3963. Also, petition of the Catholic Club of the City of New York, supporting the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910 providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, co-operative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking

licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3964. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution adopted by the Long Beach Apartment House Association on April 6, 1934, recommending that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation be extended to apartment house properties; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3965. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the National Woman's Party, New York City, urging the passage of House bill 3673; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3966. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Diocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, comprising the counties of Kings, Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk, in New York State, urging the passage of the amendment proposed by Father Harney to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3967. Also, petition of Frederick Rasmussen, Brooklyn, N.Y., opposing the passage of the stock-exchange bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3968. Also, petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Washington, D.C., favoring the passage of the Sweeney antifurlough bill (H.R. 9046); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3969. Also, telegram from Valentine & Co., New York City, protesting against the additional 3-cent process tax on various oils, including perilla-fish and other marine-animal oils or combinations thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3970. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, New York City, concerning adequate air-mail facilities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3971. Also, petition of the National Customs Service Association, New York Branch, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 7866 and Senate bill 2831; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3972. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of the executives and members of the Farrington Manufacturing Co., of Boston, Mass., relating to the national-securities exchange legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3973. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition in the nature of a memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring direct loans to industry by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3974. By Mr. O'CONNOR: Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, supporting United States Senate bill 2190; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3975. Also, petition of the Committee for the Protection of Depositors Bank of Europe Trust Co., city of New York, supporting House bill 8479, introduced by Hon. CLARENCE E. McLEOD; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3976. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Brooklyn Diocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, of the diocese of Brooklyn, N.Y., favoring the proposed amendment of Rev. John B. Harney, C.S.P., to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3977. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, favoring the reestablishment of adequate air-mail facilities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3978. Also, petition of the Automobile and Vehicle Workers Local Union, No. 18065, New York City, favoring the Wagner-Connery bill and also the Connery 30-hour week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

3979. Also, petition of the National Woman's Party, New York City, committee, favoring the passage of House bill 3673; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3980. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Common Council, Detroit, Mich., endorsing the McLeod bill to pay off bank depositors 100 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.



3981. Also, petition of the Central Citizens Committee, Detroit, Mich., endorsing the McLeod bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3982. Also, petition of the Common Council of Detroit Mich., endorsing the McLeod bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3983. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Albert Hitsman, of Millington, Mich., and 25 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 6110; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3984. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Mary's Council of the N.C. of C.W., Little Falls, N.Y., urging adoption of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3985. Also, petition of the New York Assembly, Catholic Daughters of America, urging adoption of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3986. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, opposing the Jones-Costigan sugar bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3987. Also, petition of the city of Chicago, Ill., endorsing the McLeod bank bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3988. Also, petition of the Knights of Columbus, Council No. 917, regarding the treatment of radio station WLWL; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3989. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of Brooklyn, N.Y., regarding the treatment of radio station WLWL; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3990. Also, petition of Charles J. Miville and others regarding the treatment of Radio Station WLWL; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3991. Also, petition of St. Paul's Rectory, Belle Fourche, S.Dak., regarding the treatment of Radio Station WLWL; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3992. Also, petition of the Students' Spiritual Council of the city of Yonkers, N.Y., regarding the treatment of Radio Station WLWL; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3993. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of Woodhaven, Long Island, N.Y., regarding the treatment of Radio Station WLWL; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

3994. Also, petition of the board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging the passage of the McLeod bank bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.